# PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE

# PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE

A Critical Analysis of Bourgeois Theories

Progress Publishers
Moscow

Translated from the Russian by *Bryan Bean*
Designed by *Victor Korolkov*

## REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

Проблемы войны и мира

*На английском языке*

*First printing 1972*

*Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

# CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Introduction | 5 |
| PART ONE. *The Quest for Peace in the Social Thought of the Past* | |
| Chapter I. Utopian Socialism and Problems of Peace | 19 |
| Chapter II. The Idea of Universal Peace in the Theories of the Bourgeois Humanists (16th-18th Centuries) | 39 |
| PART TWO. *The Origins and Essence of War* | |
| Chapter III. The Dialectics of War and Peace | 57 |
| Chapter IV. Politics and War in Our Time | 77 |
| Chapter V. The Monopolies and War | 100 |
| Chapter VI. Bourgeois Philosophy and Problems of War and Peace | 111 |
| Chapter VII. National Sovereignty and War | 130 |
| Chapter VIII. Against Justification of War by Malthusianism and Geopolitics | 146 |
| Chapter IX. Western Social Psychology on the Causes of Wars and the Means of Averting Them | 163 |
| PART THREE. *Against the Ideology of Militarism and Reaction. For Peace and Social Progress* | |
| Chapter X. American Doctrines of Power Politics | 189 |
| Chapter XI. The Theory of Games in International Affairs | 214 |
| Chapter XII. Who Is Opposed to Peaceful Coexistence | 229 |
| Chapter XIII. Criticism of the Interpretation of Peaceful Coexistence As Preserving the Social *Status Quo* | 244 |
| Chapter XIV. Against the Theory of Ideological Disarmament | 268 |
| Chapter XV. Modern Catholicism and Problems of War and Peace | 293 |
| Chapter XVI. Pacifist Ideology Today. The American Quaker Movement | 306 |

Chapter XVII. Western Scientists and Intellectuals and the Quest for Peace . . . . . 330
Chapter XVIII. The Pugwash Movement . . . . . 351
Chapter XIX. The Soviet Disarmament Programme and Its Critics . . . . . 359
Chapter XX. The Peace Movement and Socialist Humanism . 376

# INTRODUCTION

The monstrous brutalities of fascist aggression, all the boundless grief and suffering caused by the Second World War are still fresh in people's memories. The courage and heroism shown by the peoples of the Soviet Union who bore the main brunt of the fighting against nazi Germany, defending the freedom and independence of their homeland and saving world civilisation from destruction, will be remembered for all time. Today the peoples of the world are constantly aware of the danger of war. Despite a marked aggravation of its inherent contradictions, imperialism has retained its aggressive nature, as revealed in the arms race and the launching of local wars. This is largely connected with the increasing influence of the "military-industrial complex" in the most highly developed capitalist countries, the alliance between the big monopolies and the military clique in the state machine.

One of the most serious dangers imperialism presents to the peoples of the world is the threat of a new world war. The sinister mushroom-shaped cloud of Hiroshima serves as a grim warning of the tragic consequences a third world war launched by imperialism would have for mankind. A world conflict in present-day conditions, when intercontinental missiles can devastate vast areas of the globe in a matter of minutes, would mean death for hundreds of millions of people and the reduction to ashes of the treasures of world civilisation.

Wars, acts of violence and aggression and infringement on national sovereignty all have their origin in imperialist policies.

In the 1960s the USA and other imperialist powers committed acts of armed aggression against Vietnam, Cuba, Panama, the Dominican Republic and the Arab states.

The Americans are waging the war in Vietnam with the most barbarous methods. The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in June 1969 expressed the violent indignation of progressives everywhere over the armed aggression of the forces of imperialism in Vietnam, and appealed to all men of good will, to all who cherish peace, justice, national freedom and independence, to make every effort to strengthen and coordinate the activities of the anti-imperialist forces in support of the people of Vietnam.

The war being waged by the American imperialists in Indochina is an unlawful, pirate war. It is in fact a colonial war, an act of military intervention, violating the right of nations to self-determination, the right of the people of Vietnam to choose their own road.

The barbarous crimes perpetrated by the American interventionists against the Vietnamese people, the use of biological, chemical and other means of mass destruction—amounting to nothing short of genocide—violate the conscience of humanity, and have revealed to the peoples of the world the true, inhuman essence of imperialism.

All this has led to the increasing political and moral isolation of the aggressor by broad sections of the world public, up to and including the ruling circles in certain capitalist countries. Even in the USA, ever wider sections of the population are protesting against the dirty war in Vietnam, the consequences of which are rocking American society to the very foundations.

The heroic resistance of the Vietnamese people is a determining factor in the anti-imperialist movement of the peoples.

Despite his gigantic war machine, the aggressor found himself forced to call an unconditional halt to bombing raids over the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and sit down at a four-sided conference table for peace talks, with the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam as a full and equal participant. Meanwhile the NLF forces are striking heavy blows at the US interventionists and their puppets. People's

government has been established in most areas, and the bankrupt puppet regime is only held in power at the point of US imperialist bayonets.

In 1967 Israel launched an aggressive war on the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. Since that time the Israeli ruling circles supported by the imperialists, and first and foremost by the American imperialists and the Zionists, have continued to occupy the Arab territories seized during the aggression, refusing to carry out UN resolutions, following an expansionist and annexationist policy, practising repression of the Arab population in the occupied territories and continually mounting new military provocations.

The Israeli aggression represents a gross violation of the rights of the Arab people, including the Arab population of Palestine, a gross violation of the UN Charter which condemns all acts of aggression. Peace and order can only be restored in the area following the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the occupied territories and the full implementation of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967.

Imperialist plots and provocations directed against Cuba, many Asian, African and Latin American countries, and along the coast of Korea constitute a continual threat to peace.

The imperialists resort to all sorts of false arguments in the attempt to mask the criminal nature of their wars and other anti-democratic actions. They make anti-communism their main ideological platform, justifying militarism and aggression, and although such arguments are based on lies and falsification it would be wrong to underestimate the influence of such reactionary propaganda on people's minds.

In view of the increased danger of war with which we are now faced, a sober scientific examination of problems of war and peace acquires a special significance as providing a firm ideological foundation for the struggle against anti-communist fabrications and for the practical activities of the peace movement.

Action for peace can only be conducted purposefully and effectively provided people are aware of the most suitable methods to adopt and understand the real essence of the situation obtaining in the world.

The Communists offer a clear and precise answer to the vexed questions of war and peace. The attempts of the international Communist movement to curb the aggressors and prevent a new world conflict are based on a sober analysis accord-

ing to the principles of dialectical materialism of the new relationship of forces in the international arena. However, for such attempts to be effective, it is necessary to enlist the broadest sections of the masses, to increase active involvement of all the forces of peace.

The degree to which such active efforts can be effective depends directly on the degree to which the right paths of action are indicated, the degree of solidarity and awareness of the broad front of supporters of peace, the degree of their understanding of the real origins of the threat of war. At the present time, success or failure of the peace movement depends to a considerable extent on a scientific interpretation of the theory of peaceful coexistence.

Appeals for peace based on false, unscientific premises, and the advancing of utopian slogans can only do serious damage to the cause of peace and social progress.

Problems of war and peace are extremely diverse and complex. They are analysed by experts working in various disciplines in both the natural and social sciences. Economists, historians, specialists in law and international affairs all find vast scope for exercising their respective knowledge and abilities, while sociologists too find a great deal in these problems that falls within their province.

War and peace are essentially social phenomena: they are inseparable from society, from concrete historical conditions. Any attempt to analyse problems of war and peace that fails to take this into account is foredoomed from the outset to complete failure.

This book comprises articles by Soviet philosophers and experts in international affairs. No attempt has been made to deal with the problems of war and peace from the point of view of military strategy. The book is rather concerned with the ideological struggle currently being waged over issues of war and peace, with the spotlight on the root causes of war and the need for a scientific interpretation of the theory of peaceful coexistence. For it is over these issues that numerous views are current in the capitalist countries with which we find it impossible to agree and which require thorough investigation and exposure. The fact that unscientific views are very often held not only by the opponents but also by the supporters of the peaceful settlement of international conflicts makes necessary an especially thorough and well-argumented scientific dialogue and polemic with them.

The authors have attempted to examine some of the most widespread sociological and socio-political theories of war and peace in the capitalist West, and confront them with the scientific Marxist standpoint.

A scientific analysis of social development inevitably leads to the conclusion that imperialism is the sole cause of aggressive, reactionary wars in the conditions obtaining in our time.

Imperialism, and imperialism alone, bears full responsibility for the two world wars, the most destructive and costly wars in history. The ten years of world war in the twentieth century cost mankind far more than all the wars in the preceding three centuries.

Three million were killed in wars in Europe in the seventeenth century, 5,200,000 in the eighteenth century and 5,500,000 in the nineteenth century. In the First World War the number of fatal casualties, excluding civilians, was 10 million, with a further twenty million disabled. In the Second World War 54 million were killed, and over 90 million wounded, of which some 28 million were permanently disabled. Two million civilians were killed in air raids.

The two world wars caused colossal material damage. In the First World War material damage is estimated to have amounted to 338,000 million dollars. The figure for the Second World War is 4,000,000 million dollars, of which some 500,000 million in the Soviet Union.

Both world wars involved tremendous military expenditure, and this is actually still on the increase. Direct military expenditure amounted to 208,000 million dollars in the First World War and 1,380,000 million dollars in the Second World War.

US military expenditure alone in the years 1946 to 1968 amounted to 1,050,000 million dollars, or over twice as much as in the whole history of the United States prior to 1945. And this in a world where millions live in abject poverty, where disease, hunger, and illiteracy are still rife!

Today the aggressive nature of imperialism is manifesting itself with renewed vigour. American military expenditure over the last five years amounted to some 350,000 million dollars, or twenty per cent more than during the Second World War.

According to US official sources, by the end of 1968 American casualties in Vietnam were in the order of a quarter of a million killed or wounded. The war in Vietnam had already

cost the United States 100,000 million dollars. This money might well have been spent as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| The war on poverty in the USA . . . . | 70,000 million dollars |
| The Building of: | |
| Hospitals, etc . . . . . | 21,000 million dollars |
| Homes for old-age pensioners, etc. | 7,000 million dollars |
| *Total* | 98,000 million dollars[1] |

[1] See *United States News & World Report*, Nov. 11, 1968.

While 20,000 million dollars was being spent on a war against a people numbering 30 million souls, a mere 600 million dollars was allocated for "economic aid" to developing Asian countries with a population of over 800 million.

To put it another way: while, on the one hand, seventy cents (the price of a packet of cigarettes) is being spent on every inhabitant of the Asian countries under Washington's patronage with the aim of "helping him live", on the other hand, according to *Washington Post*, 322,000 dollars is being spent on every Vietnamese with the aim of helping him die. Such is the true face of American imperialism today. This is just one of the many facts which go to show that the threat of war will continue to exist as long as imperialism exists.

Yet many people still fail to recognise the real root of war. This is largely due to the wide currency of various false theories of the causes of war. It is such theories that the present work sets out to analyse.

The views examined include the theory that ascribes the causes of war to human nature, the Malthusian and geopolitical views, attributing the causes of war to demographic pressure and various geographical factors, and the wholly unfounded concept of "international anarchy", based on the false premise that national sovereignty is the major cause of war. This last view is usually combined with reactionary utopian plans for the creation of a World State with a powerful police force to "restrain the nations", and is thus extremely harmful since it leads many people who sincerely support peace to adopt a wrong course of action.

In many countries there are to be found reactionary politicians and scholars who openly support militarism and aggression, attempting to provide sociological justification of "power politics" and "scientific" apologia for reactionary foreign policies in general.

This aggressive course represents a serious threat to peace, and makes the greatest vigilance and readiness to defend the gains of socialism a vital historical necessity of our age.

At the same time, quite apart from such open apologia for militarism and aggression, many other views on war and peace are gaining wide currency which, although ostensibly advocating peaceful coexistence, nevertheless deserve the most resolute criticism and condemnation. Thus, some ideologists in capitalist countries are wont to interpret peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems as something quite separate from social progress, and in some cases even in a manner that is contrary to the interests of social progress, attempting to extend it to such internal processes as the class struggle in capitalist countries, the national liberation movement, and so on. Such views are at once unscientific, in that their adherents reject the idea of social progress or attempt to obstruct it, and reactionary, in that they are trying to outlaw the revolutionary struggle of peoples for their national and social emancipation and are violating the elementary principles of democracy.

Every people has the sacred right to take up arms in defence of its freedom and independence. The scientific theory of peaceful coexistence defends the right of every people to resolve the problems of its social development independently, and is opposed to the imperialist policy of interference in the affairs of other peoples and the export of counter-revolution.

The policy of peaceful coexistence has nothing at all to do with defending the social system of exploitation, or with renunciation of the class struggle and wars of national liberation. On the contrary, it creates the best possible conditions from the point of view of the masses for the solution of class conflicts and ensures further social progress without the risk of a new world war.

The Communists have never separated the question of war and peace from the interests of national and social emancipation. Over half a century ago, the very next day after the crea-

tion of the world's first workers' and peasants' state, on October 26 (November 8), 1917, Lenin made a speech on peace, in which he declared: "The question of peace is a burning question, the painful question of the day. . . .

"The workers' and peasants' government, created by the Revolution of October 24-25 and basing itself on the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, calls upon all the belligerent peoples and their governments to start immediate negotiations for a just, democratic peace.

"By a just or democratic peace, for which the overwhelming majority of the working class and other working people of all the belligerent countries, exhausted, tormented and racked by the war, are craving—a peace that has been most definitely and insistently demanded by the Russian workers and peasants ever since the overthrow of the tsarist monarchy—by such a peace the government means an immediate peace without annexations (i.e. without the seizure of foreign lands, without the forcible incorporation of foreign nations) and without indemnities."[1]

The first act of the Soviet state in the field of foreign policy was Lenin's historic Decree on Peace passed on October 26 (November 8), 1917, in which questions of peace were closely linked with the fundamental interests of the working people.

Faithful to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet Union resolutely champions the cause of peace among the nations, consistently defends the interests of the working people and follows the Leninist principle of equality of all countries, irrespective of size.

This was well summed up in the Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 24th Party Congress in March 1971: "The goals of Soviet foreign policy, as formulated by the 23rd Congress of the CPSU, consist in ensuring, together with other socialist countries, favourable international conditions for the construction of socialism and communism; in consolidating the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries, their friendship and brotherhood; supporting the national liberation movement and engaging in all-round cooperation with the young developing states; consistently standing up for the principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, giving a resolute rebuff to the

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 249.

aggressive forces of imperialism, and safeguarding mankind from another world war."[1]

This policy aimed at the preservation and consolidation of peace serves the fundamental interests of all the peoples of the world and is manifested in concrete activities of the peace movement.

The Soviet Union, together with the fraternal peoples of the other socialist countries and all revolutionary and progressive forces everywhere, is waging a continuous struggle against the aggressive and reactionary policy of imperialism, for the triumph of peace, democracy, national independence, socialism and communism. The Soviet Union and the friendly socialist countries are making joint efforts towards the implementation of these principles. The Karlovy Vary Conference, the Declaration of the Central Committees of Communist and Workers' Parties and the governments of the socialist countries in connection with the Israeli aggression in the Middle East, Alexei Kosygin's speech at the extraordinary session of the UN, the resolution adopted by the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU "On the Policy of the Soviet Union in Connection with Aggression by Israel in the Middle East", the speech made by Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs Andrei Gromyko at the 24th Session of the UN General Assembly, in which he announced the Soviet Government proposals concerning the strengthening of international security including several urgent measures designed to avert and obviate threats to peace and suppress acts of aggression; the proposal for the "conclusion of a convention forbidding the elaboration, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons and calling for the destruction of the existing stocks" submitted to the General Assembly by the Soviet Union, Poland, Hungary, Mongolia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, the Ukraine and Byelorussia—all these and other measures testify to the great efforts the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are making to preserve peace.

The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in June 1969 issued an Appeal for Peace. It contained the following: "Today lasting peace is no longer a utopia—it is a fully feasible aim. Mighty social and political forces exist in the world today which oppose war and work for

---

[1] *Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Moscow, 1971, pp. 8-9.

a relaxation of tension and broad international co-operation. The consistent peace policy of the first socialist country—the Soviet Union—and other socialist states, the intensification of the working people's struggle in the capitalist countries, the growth of the national liberation movement, and action by broad circles of world democratic opinion and by peace fighters remove the fatal inevitability of another world war and create a real possibility for effectuating the striving of the peoples for peace."[1]

The tense international situation undoubtedly complicates the struggle for peace, yet even so progressive forces still have real opportunities for curbing the imperialists and forcing them to accept disarmament.

A fierce ideological struggle is being waged over the disarmament programme proposed by the Soviet Union. All kinds of argument are put forward against this programme, and the most typical of these are examined in the present work. We consider it essential that these questions be debated, especially since the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are doing everything in their power to resolve the problem of disarmament.

The best representatives of the intelligentsia of other countries are among the progressive forces actively supporting peace. One of our aims in this book has been to note the positive contribution to the cause of peace which is being made by the progressive scholars of the capitalist world. Many of them, although not from the Marxist standpoint, are playing an active role in the peace movement and sharply condemn aggressive imperialist foreign policy.

The prime task of all supporters of peace and progress is to tighten their ranks in the struggle against the forces of reaction and imperialist militarism, and put an end to the intervention of the aggressors in the affairs of the Vietnamese, Arab and other peoples.

* * *

This book is divided into three parts.

Part One, entitled "The Quest for Peace in the Social Thought of the Past", contains two chapters—"Utopian Social-

[1] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*, Peace and Socialism Publishers, Prague, 1969, p. 48.

ism and Problems of Peace" by Y. G. Panfilov and "The Idea of Universal Peace in the Theories of the Bourgeois Humanists (16th-18th Centuries)" by I. S. Andreyev.

There are several reasons for the special attention that has been devoted to the ideas of the utopian communists and the sixteenth to eighteenth century humanists. The first is that the contribution made by the forerunners of scientific communism to the theory of war and peace is generally ignored by bourgeois scholars. Another important reason is that these progressive thinkers of the past all to a greater or lesser extent examined the subject in a social context.

Part Two, "The Origins and Essence of War", is chiefly concerned with studying the essence of war and peace from the standpoint of dialectical materialism, and critically analysing false, unscientific theories of the origins of war. It contains the following chapters: "The Dialectics of War and Peace" by N. V. Karabanov; "Politics and War in Our Time" by T. R. Kondratkov; "The Monopolies and War" by V. Y. Abol-tin; "Bourgeois Philosophy and Problems of War and Peace" by B. T. Grigoryan; "National Sovereignty and War" by Y. D. Modrzhinskaya; "Against Justification of War by Malthusianism and Geopolitics" by B. Y. Smulevich and "Western Social Psychology on the Causes of Wars and the Means of Averting Them" by Y. M. Kondakov.

Part Three, "Against the Ideology of Militarism and Reaction. For Peace and Social Progress", analyses the main trends in the current ideological struggle over questions related to the problem of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems.

The chapters in this section are as follows: "American Doctrines of Power Politics" by B. A. Shabad; "The Theory of Games in International Affairs" by G. I. Gerasimov; "Who Is Opposed to Peaceful Coexistence" by V. I. Zamkova; "Criticism of the Interpretation of Peaceful Coexistence As Preserving the Social *Status Quo*" by G. B. Starushenko; "Against the Theory of Ideological Disarmament" by A. P. Butenko; "Modern Catholicism and Problems of War and Peace" by L. N. Velikovich; "Pacifist Ideology Today. The American Quaker Movement" by L. N. Mitrokhin; "Western Scientists and Intellectuals and the Quest for Peace" by A. G. Grigoryan; "The Pugwash Movement" by M. S. Voslensky; and "The Soviet Disarmament Programme and Its Critics" by A. N. Kalyadin.

The three parts are followed by a concluding chapter entitled "The Peace Movement and Socialist Humanism" by E. A. Bagramov.

This book was prepared by members of the staff of the Institute of Philosophy, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, with contributions from members of various Moscow research institutes.

# I

# THE QUEST FOR PEACE IN THE SOCIAL THOUGHT OF THE PAST

## Chapter I

# UTOPIAN SOCIALISM AND PROBLEMS OF PEACE

Eternal peace among the nations, an end to all wars, is among the greatest ideals of mankind, an ideal for which the Communists are striving. Karl Marx maintained that only peace could serve as the international principle of the new, communist society,[1] while Lenin described communism as the society of "universal prosperity and enduring peace",[2] and wrote: "An end to wars, peace among the nations, the cessation of pillaging and violence—such is our ideal."[3]

The social sciences have proved that the path to eternal peace lies through the triumph of socialism throughout the world, since this would finally eliminate the causes of all wars. It is thus the historical mission of communism to establish eternal peace in the world.

The ideal of eternal peace championed by the Marxists-Leninists has a long history. It was developed over many centuries by progressive social thinkers. Non-Marxist literature on the history of the development of the ideas of peace almost invariably ignores the contribution of the utopian communists—the forerunners of scientific communism—to the struggle for the triumph of justice and enduring peace in international

---

[1] See *The General Council of the First International. 1870-1871. Minutes*, Moscow, 1967, p. 328.

[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 159.

[3] Ibid., Vol. 21, p. 293.

relations. On the contrary, indeed, we find a host of all kinds of pacifists who refuse to see any connection whatsoever between the problem of peace and transformation of the economic and political foundations of society. The social significance of this kind of approach to the history of social thought is not hard to see. It amounts to a refusal to recognise the organic link between communism and international peace which was there from the very emergence of communist ideas and which was later fully developed in Marxism-Leninism.

The longing for a life without war has been one of the cherished ideals of the masses from earliest times. The ideal of eternal peace was first embodied in the legends of a Golden Age which arose in the period of fierce strife that accompanied the break-up of the tribal system when the earliest class societies (practising slavery) were being established through bloodshed and violence. Legends and tales of a Golden Age when people lived in peace and concord formed the basis of the first anti-military social utopias. Their authors idealised the society of the primitive commune and drew a picture of a society in which the evils of slave-owning society would be abolished (Jambul's novel about "the sunny land" and so on). Thus the popular ideal of eternal peace was from the very outset inseparably linked up with flashes of communist ideas—common ownership of property, comradely labour and a society without masters and slaves.

With the passing of the slave-owning societies and the advent of the Middle Ages, the view that peace could be brought about by the embodiment in the form of a single state of the vague spiritual unity of the peoples of what had been the Roman Empire became current in social thought. Apologists of the Papacy used this idea as the basis for a programme of theocratic peace, the universal dominion of the Church of Rome. The temporal powers of the feudal era, and in particular the German emperors, opposed these claims, seeking instead to revive the Roman Empire, masking these ambitions with a pretence of "concern" for peace in Europe.

By the beginning of the sixteenth century, progressive thinkers had begun to treat the problem of peace in a new way, linking it with the principle of nationality and making a clean break with the assumption that peace was only possible within the framework of a World Empire.

One of the first to raise his voice on behalf of the masses and criticise wars of plunder at the dawn of the capitalist era

was the father of utopian communism, the great English humanist Thomas More (1478-1535).

More insisted that the highest principle of government should be the people's welfare. But there is no concern for the latter in royal courts, where everyone is busy finding excuses for new adventures and all the time suggesting new plans for war. Even peace is made an object of these intrigues, attempts being made to create the impression that the prince is loving and merciful in bringing bloodshed to an end, deceiving the common people into believing that he has done so out of pity and compassion for them, whereas in fact he continues to exploit them as before.[1]

More referred to the countless mercenaries that countries were full of and occupied by even in peacetime as a "destructive pestilence". He pointed to the example of the Romans, the Carthaginians and the Syrians, whose Empires, fields and cities had on various occasions been overrun and destroyed by their own armies.[2]

More was quite aware that it was pointless to appeal to kings and their advisers with sensible arguments, and beg them to renounce their scheming and ambitions for territorial gains. "(These, and) suche other informations, yf I shoulde use among men wholye inclined and geven to the contrarye part, how deaffe hearers thinke you shoulde I have?"[3] The root of all social evils, More pointed out, was private property. "Where possessions be private, where money bearethe all the stroke, it is harde and almoste impossible that there the weale publique maye justeleye be governed, and prosperouslye floryshe."[4]

More was the author of the first attempt in the history of social thought to work out a peaceful, non-expansionist foreign policy. In place of the world of violence and injustice he proposed his dream of a wondrous land, Utopia, where private property did not exist. The inhabitants, the Utopians, abhor war as "a thing very beastly", and only resort to it for three purposes: to defend their own territory when invaded; to deliver the territory of an ally from invaders; and to free an oppressed nation from tyranny. They may also make war for the purpose of avenging insults and injuries done to them, but only after having ascertained that the other side has no intention of

---

[1] Thomas More, *Utopia*, London, 1935, p. 37.
[2] Ibid., p. 23.
[3] Ibid., p. 40.
[4] Ibid., p. 43.

making fair reparation, and is thus to be considered the aggressor.[1]

Here we see one of the most typical features of the utopian communist ideology as regards issues of war and peace. The first utopian communists, while condemning war between peoples, rejected outright the idea of pacifism. They were the first to draw a distinction between just and unjust wars, regarding as just all wars waged in the interests of the people, in defence of the communist motherland, or which served to free people from bondage, although the idea of "a just war" did not yet exist as a scientific concept. It was natural that in drawing their picture of the ideal state, the utopian communists should have devoted much attention to military training.

In war, the Utopians pity the common people among their enemies, practically as if they were their own citizens, knowing that people are driven and enforced to war against their will by the furious madness of their rulers and heads.[2] The Utopians strictly honour truces, do not lay waste their enemy's lands and even go out of their way not to damage their crops. They do not harm unarmed civilians, or put to the sack towns that have surrendered or been captured, and do not harm the civilian population or take any booty for themselves.[3] In his account of the way the Utopians behave in war, More was in fact anticipating many major principles of international law concerning humane behaviour in war.

The Utopian state maintains numerous ties with other peoples. Foreign trade is carried on not only in the interests of the Utopians but also in the interests of the poor of the countries with which they trade, making the latter a present of one-seventh of their exports.[4] One of the aims of exporting goods is to amass wealth to be used in the case of international discord for the hiring of foreign mercenaries, for paying their allies and buying off their enemies.[5] More considered that it was more humane and merciful to prevent or end a war by using money rather than arms against the enemy.

The virtues of the Utopians attract the attention of their free and enslaved neighbours; many of the former have been freed from tyranny by the Utopians. Those countries that out of envy

---

[1] Thomas More, op. cit., p. 91.
[2] Ibid., p. 94.
[3] Ibid., pp. 98-99.
[4] Ibid., p. 66.
[5] Ibid., pp. 66-67.

have made an attempt on the freedom of the Utopian state have invariably been rebuffed.

Thus, Thomas More was the first to discover the new principles of international relations that arise from the interests of preserving the communist way of life in a state surrounded by non-communist nations. Thus, approximately a century prior to the emergence of the science of international law and long before the time when, thanks to the efforts of the great thinkers of the Enlightenment, the need to build international relations on the democratic foundations of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity had been accepted by progressive social strata, More advanced the idea that communism is inseparable from the struggle against injustice in international relations.

In 1623, *The City of the Sun* by the Italian utopian philosopher Tommaso Campanella was published almost simultaneously with Hugo Grotius' treatise *De Jure Belli et Pacis* and Emeric Crucé's *The New Cyneas, or Discourse of the Occasions and Means to Establish a General Peace, and the Liberty of Commerce Throughout the Whole World.* But while Grotius was trying to put in order existing international relations, banishing arbitrariness and affirming justice, and while Crucé was thinking along the lines of creating a bourgeois civilisation by peaceful means, Campanella made a tremendous jump forward in time, linking his hopes for the triumph of justice in international relations with a communist social order.

Campanella did not present his City of the Sun as an isolated state, but as one with all sorts of ties with its neighbours, in alliance with numerous other peoples. The inhabitants make voyages for the purpose of learning about the customs of other countries, they trade with foreign merchants, and welcome foreigners in their midst, permitting any who wish it to take their citizenship. The first problem the Solarians come up against in their contacts with the outside world is that of protecting their own people's morals from corrupting outside influences.[1]

The Solarians have no real motives for embarking on wars of conquest, but they do, nonetheless, have to resort to war on occasion. The inhabitants of the City of the Sun "never commit aggression but neither do they submit to it, and they go to war only if they are attacked".[2]

---

[1] Tommaso Campanella, *La Città del Sole*, Milano, 1962, pp. 27-28.
[2] Ibid., p. 30.

The only kind of war that is permissible is "war against violators of natural justice and religion".[1] War is declared when an enemy refuses to make compensation for damage, to cease oppression of the allies of the State of the Sun, or expel a tyrant from cities that have appealed to the Solarians for help.[2] Thus, the views of the two founders of utopian communism, Thomas More and Tommaso Campanella, on just warfare are practically identical.

Campanella expressed the conviction that communism was the future of all mankind. The Solarians "maintain that the whole world will one day come to live according to their customs. . .".[3]

The people of the neighbouring countries of the island on which the City of the Sun lies want to live like the Solarians, and their rulers therefore try to conquer the City of the Sun.[4] These wars result in the overthrow of the social system of the attacking states.[5]

In the second half of the seventeenth century, another description of Utopia, its social organisation and foreign policy appeared, this time in France. It was the utopian novel *The History of the Sevarambes* by Denis Vairasse, published in two parts in 1677 and 1679. The author propounds the idea that one of the ideals of communism was to put an end to war. "Peace gives peoples tranquillity and happiness".[6]

Vairasse saw the problem of ensuring peace as primarily a moral issue. In order that peace be preserved, it was necessary in his opinion to ensure moral purity and uproot vice.[7] This involved the reorganisation of society at grass-roots level. Thus, Vairasse tells how the founder of the State of the Sevarambes (or the State of the Sun), Sevarias, made a thorough investigation of the causes of strife, wars and other evils. He finally came to the conclusion that they arise from three basic things—pride, covetousness and idleness, which are encouraged by social inequality, wealth and private property. In order to rid society of these vices and free it from the associated evils, Sevarias

---

[1] Tommaso Campanella, op. cit., p. 24.
[2] Ibid., pp. 23, 24.
[3] Ibid., p. 30.
[4] Ibid., p. 24.
[5] Ibid., p. 26.
[6] Denis Vairasse, *Histoire de Sevarambes*, Amsterdam, MDCCXVI, p. 293.
[7] Ibid., pp. 293-94.

abolished all class privileges, together with private property, and made work universally compulsory.[1] In short, Vairasse did not simply describe the foreign policy of the ideal state, but showed what engendered this policy, its historical roots.

Vairasse's State of the Sun strove to isolate itself from the rest of the world for motives of a moral, ideological nature. It avoided all relations with other nations of the Eurasian continent for fear that their vices might infect the Sevarambes.[2] However, while avoiding all bad influences, the Sevarambes took note of all good examples and useful inventions that could be borrowed from other peoples. In their relations with other countries the Sevarambes always acted *incognito*: in travelling abroad to trade or study the arts and sciences which could be of benefit to their own country, they were forbidden to tell foreigners anything about their homeland.

The Englishman Gerrard Winstanley, the leader and ideologist of the English Diggers, clearly stands head and shoulders above the other bourgeois thinkers of the seventeenth century in his understanding of the fundamental conditions for eternal peace. As early as the time of the world's first successful bourgeois revolution, he expressed the grave doubts of the working masses that the system of private ownership would ever give them peace and happiness.

We have seen how neither Thomas More nor Campanella actually made an ideal of eternal peace. Their ideal state was forced to resort to war in order to defend its rights. Winstanley was the first in the history of utopian thought to express the idea that human society based on common ownership would bring enduring peace to all nations and put an end to war. He insisted that common ownership of the land by the whole people and the freeing of the common people from bondage and servitude would "settle such a peace in the earth, as nations shall learn war no more".[3]

Characteristic of the Diggers' views was their belief that private property was the root of wars. Although this view was shared by the earlier utopians, Winstanley was the first to make it explicit in his works. The Digger Manifesto "The True Levellers' Standard Advanced" stated that "pleading for

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 275-79.
[2] Ibid., p. 168.
[3] *Selections from the Works of Gerrard Winstanley*, London, 1944, p. 119.

property and single interest divides the people of a land and the whole world into parties, and it is the cause of all wars and bloodshed, and contention everywhere".[1] In a letter to Lord Fairfax, Winstanley mentioned the connection between war and class oppression: "I demand, whether all wars, bloodshed, and misery came not upon the Creation when one man endeavoured to be a lord over another, and to claim property in the earth one above another?"[2]

In the seventeenth century, the ideologists of the ascendant bourgeoisie conceived the view that capitalist trade had a peacemaking mission to fulfil. Winstanley is strongly opposed to this view. "This buying and selling," he wrote, "did bring in, and still doth bring in, discontents and wars, which have plagued mankind sufficiently for so doing. And the nations of the world will never learn to beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks, and leave off warring, until this cheating device of buying and selling be cast out among the rubbish of kingly power."[3]

Thus Winstanley finds the earthly basis on which he believes the prophecy of Isaiah can be brought to pass.

Winstanley elaborated a somewhat original theory of historical progress, from which he proceeded to examine the history of war and peace. He represents the earliest period of history as an age of innocence in which people lived in freedom and in peace and harmony. As long as the earth was a common treasure house, the domain of all, there was no hostility between people. But in their ignorance people allowed the "subtle spirit" to drive them along the path of "buying and selling", and then covetousness, the desire for conquest and domination gradually arose. Man lost his original innocence and the spiritual blessings of universal freedom, peace and harmony. This ushered in the second stage of history, which Winstanley termed the age of kingly government. Everybody wished to become a landlord and make his brother his servant.

The rule of kings is replaced by republican rule, by which Winstanley intends society where there is common ownership of the land, without buying and selling, with the Commonwealth's Government restoring "the ancient peace and freedom".[4]

---

[1] *Selections from the Works of Gerrard Winstanley*, p. 42.
[2] Ibid., p. 59.
[3] Ibid., pp. 117-18.
[4] Ibid., p. 133.

Winstanley refers to the government of kings as "a breeder of wars",[1] and says it may well be called "the government by highwaymen".[2] "He sheds blood not to free the people from oppression, but that he may be king and ruler over the oppressed people."[3] The Commonwealth's Government, on the other hand, he describes as "the government of righteousness and peace".[4]

The progressive nature of this view is perfectly plain. Not only Winstanley's contemporaries, but indeed many later pacifists, placed their hopes of peace in an "enlightened monarch". Considerably later, Rousseau and Diderot were to advance the idea that the condition for peace was the replacement of the monarchy by republican government, but even then this did not involve for them the abolition of private ownership.

Winstanley pointed out that peoples would not all go over to republican government simultaneously. The English could be the first and the new system would then be spread by other nations following this good example. "In that Nation," Winstanley wrote, "where this Commonwealth's Government shall be first established, there shall be abundance of peace and plenty, and all Nations of the Earth shall come flocking thither to see his beauty, and to learn the ways thereof"[5] and "if this our English Commonwealth's Government carry perfect freedom in his hand, then shall the law go forth from England to all the nations of the world".[6]

In the eighteenth century the utopian communist programmes for eternal peace were closely related in content to the views expounded by the thinkers of the French Enlightenment. Essential features of Enlightenment views were to be seen in the sharp criticism of the principles of feudal absolutism in the sphere of international relations, and the condemnation of war as a survival of a barbaric age, the condemnation of conquest, coercion and authoritarian power, and passionate insistence on the equality of nations and their sovereignty in international affairs, sincere support for the interests of the masses and concern for their welfare.

The belief in the need for political interference in the "nat-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 119.
[2] Ibid., p. 131.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid., p. 121.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid., p. 127.

ural course of events" was another feature linking the utopian communists with the thinkers of the Enlightenment. But here we find another ideological current coming into play—rejection of the sincere belief held by the thinkers of the Enlightenment that the abolition of the feudal dynastic principles would automatically lead to eternal peace. Whereas the thinkers of the Enlightenment saw the path to eternal peace to lie in the creation of a union of equal states, in the abolition of monarchical government, or in the ideal of the "enlightened monarch", the utopian communists sought to demonstrate that war could only be abolished following the reorganisation of the social structure of nations on the basis of common ownership.

Jean Meslier, a revolutionary democrat, atheist and materialist, and the father of French utopian communism, devoted much effort to exposing the anti-popular nature of the foreign policy of the absolute monarchy in his critique of the social and political structure of feudal society. He likened kings to wolves and lions on the prowl in search of prey, always ready to light the flame of war and cause bloodshed and killing, always ready to destroy towns and lay fields waste.[1] He considered it was the duty of those in power "to make every endeavour to establish everywhere the reign of peace, justice and truth, which would make all the nations of the world happy and content".[2]

As for the causes of war, Meslier insisted that the bad distribution of wealth in a society where property was privately owned led to hatred and envy among people, which in turn gave rise to discontent, strife and wars.[3]

In his book *The Code of Nature, or the True Spirit of Her Laws* (1775) the French utopian communist Morelly expounded the idea that peace had been the original state of mankind. Like Winstanley a century earlier, he considered that human history began with communal society, as in accordance with both nature and reason. According to Morelly, the collapse of communal society was the source of the differences that might arise between individuals, families, or whole nations, and was the unhappy origin of all civil strife, war and brigandage.[4] Private property,

---

[1] Jean Meslier, *Le Testament*, tome II, Amsterdam, 1864, p. 283.
[2] Ibid., tome I, p. 17.
[3] Ibid., tome II, pp. 210-15.
[4] Morelly, *Code de la nature ou le véritable esprit de ses lois*, Paris, 1953, p. 6.

any division of property, whether equal or unequal, engenders the desire to subjugate others.[1] Thus, "the most humane and mild nations have always been those that have practically no property, or which have not yet established it universally".[2]

Morelly considered that eternal peace could be achieved by gradually bringing all nations to accept the new order by means of setting an example. "Peaceful laws which would have increasingly strengthened the social relations of a humane, beneficent people, would have served as a powerful example to another nation: these wise institutions would have spread their mild authority throughout the earth and would have caused the weapons to fall from the hands of the fiercest peoples."[3]

Morelly said nothing like as much as his predecessors about the actual form international relations should take in the future. But he made a great step forward in the understanding of the new principles of international relations by formulating as a law of the society of the future the extending of aid to other peoples. "If the nation helps a neighbouring or foreign nation with its own produce, or is likewise helped, this is the only form of trade by means of exchange.... Great care will be taken to ensure that such trade does not introduce the least property into the Republic."[4]

L'Abbé de Mably was another thinker who imagined the initial period of human history as a Golden Age, a natural communist society. "Some philosophers have claimed that we are all born enemies to one another, and that from their first breath men have wished to make war, tear one another asunder and enslave one another."[5]

He considered this to be "an absurd philosophy" and offered his own historical theory as to the causes of war. According to him, the division of property, the introduction of private ownership and the resulting social inequality were to be regarded as the prime source of all human sufferings. Property destroyed the natural ties that had linked mankind. People who are accustomed to property tend to think that their wealth will increase if their frontiers are expanded at their neighbours' expense. Hence the outbreak of foreign wars,[6] which occur

[1] Ibid., p. 59.
[2] Ibid., p. 121.
[3] Ibid., p. 74.
[4] Ibid., p. 74.
[5] *Oeuvres complètes de l'Abbé de Mably*, London, 1789, Vol. 9, p. 60.
[6] Ibid., p. 13.

entirely as a result of "our failure to conform with the intentions and laws of nature".[1] A return to the laws of nature, a return, that is, to communist society, will ensure enduring peace. "Would not citizens without private fortunes, rich by virtue of the common weal, have, on the contrary, more reason not to trouble the calm of their neighbours?"[2]

The approaching "reign of the bourgeoisie" could not in l'Abbé de Mably's opinion be the reign of peace. In response to the request of Franklin and Adams that he express his opinion on the Constitution of the United States, he declared that unless material inequality were abolished in the United States, the country would inevitably take the path of aggression against other peoples, which would lead to an alliance of the latter against the "new Carthaginians".

During the years of the Thermidor reaction that followed the overthrow of the Jacobin dictatorship, Babeuf founded Le Derectoire Secret de Salut Publique, with the aim of preparing an armed revolution in France, setting up a dictatorship of the plebeians, which would gradually implement the egalitarian communist programme of the members of the conspiracy. For Babeuf and the revolutionaries grouped round him, the question of the policy that the plebeian government should adopt towards other peoples was not merely a subject for abstract theory but a matter of immediate practical concern. The foreign policy programme of the members of the Conspiracy of Equals essentially embodied the just principles of international politics elaborated by the eighteenth-century utopian communists, but took them a stage further in the light of the ideas of revolutionary government by the masses of the poor.

Babeuf's supporters considered that every kind of aggressive war should be expressly forbidden by law. They considered that it was their duty to instil in the people a "loathing for conquests". The desire for conquest and plundering would be totally alien to the people who had set up the communal order. They would have neither the desire nor the opportunity to take up arms to oppress their neighbours. They would "only wage war in order to repel an enemy invasion or aid a neighbour who was being unjustly oppressed".[3]

---

[1] *Ouvres complètes de l'Abbé de Mably*, Vol. 9, p. 191.

[2] Ibid., p. 14.

[3] Ph. Buonaroti, *Conspiration pour l'égalité dite de Babeuf*, Paris, 1957, p. 80.

Respect for international law and support of international peace was to be the cornerstone of the foreign policy of the Babeuvists' communist state. But since respect for international law was not enough to ensure that the country was safeguarded against foreign invasion, the people must always be prepared to defend the frontiers of their land, and must be well capable of bearing arms.

It was the duty of all peoples to help one another defend and restore "the natural rights". But manifestations of fraternal feelings do not go together very well with acts of violence, the inevitable consequence of war. The French Republic could not impose its principles on other peoples by force of arms, but should carry out its duty towards other peoples "above all by giving the world a shining example of the powerful establishment based on equality and liberty".[1]

"Barbed-wire fences" should be erected between France and her neighbours to protect the French Republic from the pernicious influence of foreign morals and institutions alien to the spirit of freedom and equality and to prevent outside interference in the country's internal affairs. Thus, in order to prohibit corruption and the evils that arise from private ownership, foreign trade should be entirely in the hands of the highest governing bodies of the Republic.[2] But the Babeuvists had no intention of isolating France completely from the rest of the world: anybody who wished to learn about French institutions, anybody who came to the country with a sincere desire to find equality and happiness, would be perfectly welcome.

The Babeuvists' foreign policy programme shows that their social aims were inseparably linked up with the struggle for the establishment of just peace between the nations. The rejection of wars of conquest, observance of international law, the defence of their communist homeland, refusal to impose their principles on other peoples by force of arms, help for oppressed nations and, finally, the institution of freedom and equality in their country as fulfilment of their duty to all the peoples of the world—such were the principles of the foreign policy of future communism put forward by the Babeuvists on the basis of the utopian social ideas of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Lenin pointed out, as Marx had done before him, that the principles put forward by Babeuf and his supporters

[1] Ibid., p. 28.
[2] Ibid., p. 163.

"consistently developed, contained the idea of a new Weltzustand (world order)".[1]

With the rise of capitalism, the awareness of a contradiction between war and the development of production acted as a stimulus to intense activity on the part of Free Traders, pacifists, and various kinds of philanthropists, who wished to put right the evils of the capitalist system, manifested, among other things, in destructive wars between nations, without abolishing the basic conditions of bourgeois society. Pacifists and the Free Traders went to a great deal of trouble to collect and present facts and figures in order to prove their view that wars intended to promote the interests of national trade and the subjugation of other peoples were highly detrimental to trade and production, and caused great material and moral damage. But in speaking of the unprofitability of wars for a nation as a whole, they overlooked the fact that it might be profitable for some. As a result, they found themselves faced by the following paradox: if war was unprofitable, what was it that forced nations to act against their own interests, and why did war continue to hold sway among the nations? The pacifists were unable to answer this question for the simple reason that they failed to perceive the fundamental connection between war and the capitalist system of production, between war and the basic interests of the bourgeoisie.

It was the utopian communists, with their awareness of the connection between war and relations based on private property, who were the first to point to this connection in progressive social thought. As we have already seen, the first ideologists of the deprived classes, the utopian communists of the 16th-18th centuries, saw the abolition of private property as the precondition for enduring peace. The idea that the substitution of socialism for the bourgeois system would put an end to wars underlay the theories of eternal peace of the great nineteenth-century utopian socialists Fourier and Robert Owen.

Fourier pointed out that wars were a recurrent phenomenon in "civilised society", i.e., from the slave-holding societies, through the feudal to bourgeois society, while peace was but a fleeting vision, briefly glimpsed from time to time. Commercial rivalry, which "has for so long bathed Europe in blood, continues to erupt and holds the political world on the brink of a volcano whose devastation will not cease as long as it is only

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 40.

countered by feudal despotism instead of being countered by social genius". A bourgeois army is a real social parasite, a minority of armed slaves holding in check the majority of unarmed slaves. Only a harmonious, that is, a socialist society "will establish general unity in the world and cause the disappearance of wars, revolutions, poverty and injustice...".[1]

There is no room for war either in Robert Owen's New Moral World. Owen's analysis of bourgeois society brought him to the conclusion that "another organisation of society to terminate war, its immoralities, its miseries, and its insanities, is become necessary and irresistible".[2] The governments of all countries would soon be forced in the interests of self-preservation to accept a more perfect and rational social system, in order to avoid anarchy, war and calamity. Only the total destruction of the old social system and the introduction of a new one would forever put an end to rivalry, strife and wars.

In proposing the replacement of the capitalist system by a new, socialist system, both Fourier and Owen believed that the whole of bourgeois society, including the ruling class, could not but be interested in the direct benefits mankind would derive from the social transformations they recommended. They did not perceive that the interests of the bourgeoisie involved the preservation of the system of exploitation and were antagonistic to the interests of the working people. In this respect the utopian socialists might appear to hold similar views to the pacifists on problems of war and peace, since both direct their appeals to society as a whole without drawing a distinction between the different classes or making any exception for the ruling class. In point of fact, however, a wide gulf separates them, for the pacifists are utopians in that they are yearning for the impossible—capitalism without wars, eternal peace on the basis of the bourgeois system—while the utopian socialists are utopian in that they do not know what force is capable of abolishing capitalism and establishing eternal peace. These two different approaches to the problems of war and peace lead to completely opposite consequences: the pacifists try to embellish capitalism, while the utopian socialists castigate it as the system that breeds wars.

The theories of Saint-Simon were out of tune with the gen-

---

[1] *Oeuvres complètes de Charles Fourier*, tome 1, Paris, 1966, p. 86.
[2] Robert Owen, *The Book of the New Moral World*, London, 1844, pp. 15-16.

eral theories of the early nineteenth-century utopians, who glorified socialism as a system that would ensure enduring peace. While considering that with the new system "the scourge of war would leave Europe, never to return", he held that general European peace would not mean an end to wars against the peoples of Africa and Asia in order to force happiness on them.[1] It was no accident that Saint-Simon should have parted ways with the humanist tradition of utopian socialism, for his was a racist, chauvinist brand of "socialism", and racism and chauvinism go hand in hand with war.

The development of class contradictions in bourgeois society by the 1840s made room for several amendments to the views of the utopian socialists, and the ideologists of the disinherited classes began to acquire a deeper understanding of the interests of the different classes in bourgeois society, and to take into account these differences in class interests in their appraisal of wars. Thus, Louis Auguste Blanqui, the outstanding representative of the revolutionary wing of French utopian communism of the 1830s and 1840s, pointed out that in the Napoleonic wars the interests of the bourgeoisie had been very different from the interests of the masses. He also perceived how the interests of the bourgeoisie were quite contrary to the interests of the masses with regard to the policy of the counter-revolutionary Holy Alliance.[2]

These developments in pre-Marxian progressive social thought in the nineteenth century with regard to the scientific theory of war and peace culminated in the views developed in the 1850s by the outstanding Russian revolutionary democrat and utopian socialist, Nikolai Chernyshevsky.

Chernyshevsky approached the whole question of war and peace from the point of view of the "working man". Opposed to the use of force in international affairs and stressing the destruction caused by wars and the inevitable pain and suffering they brought the working people, he only recognised as "useful" those wars that were waged in defence of one's homeland. "Any war is ruinous to the working man," he wrote. "Only a war that is waged to drive enemies from one's homeland is useful."[3]

---

[1] *Oeuvres choisies de C.-H. de Saint-Simon*, Bruxelles, 1839, p. 38.
[2] A. Blanqui, *Textes choisis*, Paris, 1955, pp. 85-86, 96-97.
[3] N. G. Chernyshevsky, *Selected Philosophical Works*, Vol. II, Russ. ed,. Moscow, 1950, p. 198.

Chernyshevsky discerned the organic link between war and the interests of the ruling class. Thus, in examining the policy of Napoleon III's ruling clique which threatened to embroil the French nation in destructive wars, Chernyshevsky pointed out that the only way to escape from such a policy for France was to expel from French life those elements that were leading her to war contrary to her interests. Later, on the subject of England's colonial war in the East Indies, he wrote that "the war is unprofitable for the nation, but is very much to the advantage of the class that rules England. . .".[1]

Chernyshevsky considered that the way to put an end to war was for the working classes to assume a decisive role in the affairs of state. "When the working class gains a decisive influence in English affairs," he wrote, "and becomes experienced enough in them to judge according to the interests of labour and not according to what is impressed on it by people to whom these interests are alien, England will completely renounce all wars outside her own frontiers. When the same situation obtains in other European countries, all possibility of war between them will disappear. But until such time, wars are inevitable, although completely contrary to the real interests of each of the belligerent nations. . .".[2]

As to the causes of war, Chernyshevsky considered that war was the direct product of the "civil order of society". The warlike inclination common to all the European nations, he wrote, "an inclination that is so unnatural for working people and yet which still holds sway over European life, developed and persists as a result of the social order of those nations. . .".[3]

Thus, in the nineteenth century the ideologists of the masses made a considerable advance towards the discovery of the causes of war and peace. They began to link up hopes of peace with the historical activity of the masses, and perceived the connection between war and the interests of the ruling class.

Nevertheless, they did not adhere consistently to this view. This was particularly evident in the way the utopian socialists saw the bourgeoisie not as the ruling class in bourgeois society delegating the management of their affairs to the aristocracy, but as the "middle class", and were unable to determine the latter's role in the occurrence of wars. Thus, Chernyshevsky

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid., p. 199.
[3] Ibid.

supposed that as the direct participation of the English manufacturers in state affairs increased there would be less likelihood of war, although he admitted that he did not consider them fit to express the interests of labour.[1] Dezamy also inclined to the opinion that the bourgeoisie was capable of playing a part in implementing the principle of common ownership, which would link all men with ties of boundless brotherhood, free from narrow nationalism.[2] Thus, even utopian socialists with the most scientific approach at that time, like Chernyshevsky and Dezamy, failed to appreciate the fact that the working people and the bourgeoisie represented opposite poles over matters of war and peace.

This tendency is even more evident in the case of the petty-bourgeois utopian socialists. John Gray, the foremost English representative of the latter in the first half of the nineteenth century, shared all the illusions common to the bourgeois manufacturers and the pacifists in the question of ensuring peace. He wrote: "Improve the conditions of mankind universally by the establishment of free trade, in the most comprehensive sense of the term, and fighting will die a natural death in its own good time".[3]

The prerequisites for a scientific interpretation of problems of war and peace were created with the development of the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie.

Robert Owen's Grand National Consolidated Trades' Union of Great Britain and Ireland, the aim of which was to take over the country's production and gradually transform the economy on the socialist pattern by organising the workers in co-operatives, had as one of its main political demands: "Wars to cease; and all differences between nations to be adjusted by an annual congress, to be held in rotation in each of the different states".[4] Owen believed that this union of workers would allow for "arrangements to be adopted, as soon as practicable, to put an end to individual and national competition and contest, now unnecessary, and producing innumerable grievous evils to all classes".[5] This was one of the first peace programmes of the English labour movement.

---

[1] N. G. Chernyshevsky, op. cit., p. 199.

[2] T. Dezamy, *Code de la Communauté*, Paris, 1812, pp. III-VI.

[3] John Gray, *The Social System: a Treatise on the Principle of Exchange*, Edinburgh, 1831, p. 172.

[4] *The Crisis*, No. 24, Vol. III, February 8, 1834, London, p. 200.

[5] Ibid.

At the dawn of the international labour movement, in the 1840s, spokesmen for the working class and revolutionary democrats of various nations proclaimed the principle of opposition to unjust wars as an organic part of the general international tasks of the working class. The year 1845 saw the first successful attempt to unite the revolutionary democrats of various nations, which resulted in the formation of the Fraternal Democrats, an international democratic alliance comprising representatives of the Left wing of the English Chartist Movement, members of the German League of the Just, and revolutionaries of other nationalities living as émigrés in London. Addressing a meeting of this society which was attended by over a thousand democrats of almost every nation in Europe, George Harney, writer, Left-wing Chartist leader and one of the outstanding figures in the English labour movement, declared on behalf of the English workers: "We denounce all wars, except those into which nations may be forced against domestic oppressors or hostile invaders."[1]

Weitling made a speech on behalf of the German workers, in which he declared: "What other interest can all these campaigns of conquest and bloodshed have for us except that of taking advantage of the situation to turn against the robbers and butchers, the aristocracy of all nations?"

Thus, by the mid-1840s questions had been posed in progressive social thought, to which a scientific answer was essential if effective means of ensuring enduring peace were to be forthcoming. One of them was in what way war was connected with the capitalist system, the interests of the bourgeoisie and political relations between the capitalist states. Another was what social forces were capable of putting an end to war, and the question of the antagonism between the interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in international relations. There were also the questions of the peaceful nature of the new, communist system to serve as the basis for eternal peace between the nations, and of an independent peace programme of the working class, and what tactics the proletariat should adopt in the struggle to establish justice in international relations.

The solution of all these questions was the historic contribution of scientific communism, Marxist-Leninist science.[2] Marx-

---

[1] *The Northern Star*, Vol. VIII, No. 411, London.

[2] The dialectical-materialist teaching on war and peace is treated in later chapters of the present volume.

ism-Leninism brought about a revolution in views on war and peace, revealing their true essence and causes. It pointed out what socio-political forces and what methods could save mankind from disastrous wars and ensure eternal peace on earth, and banished metaphysics and idealism from the analysis of these complex and contradictory social phenomena. The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and peace serves as a powerful ideological weapon in the struggle for social progress, peace and security, the struggle to prevent a thermonuclear disaster.

## Chapter II

# THE IDEA OF UNIVERSAL PEACE IN THE THEORIES OF THE BOURGEOIS HUMANISTS (16th-18th CENTURIES)

Peace is one of the age-old ideals of mankind. The strong opposition to war of progressive people in every age has invariably been part of a wider longing for peace, universal prosperity and social justice. These humanitarian principles found their highest expression in the idea of communism. The development of the idea of universal peace in social thought throughout the ages is thus an important object of study.

In recent years a large number of works have appeared devoted to this subject. In many of them the content of the programmes for universal peace of the Enlightenment have been treated in a rather one-sided manner. In particular, the inevitable utopian elements in these theories have been used by contemporary thinkers who insist that wars are inevitable and can never be abolished; the aspects of the problem which can be interpreted as advocating class peace have been singled out and the original ideas of the thinkers of the Enlightenment deliberately distorted for the purpose of justifying the idea of World Government. For this reason, it is extremely important that the content of the ideas of universal peace expounded by the thinkers of the bourgeois Enlightenment should be scientifically analysed and substantiated.

The rise of bourgeois humanism (16th to 18th centuries) corresponded to the emergence and development of capitalism. The age of primary accumulation of capital gave rise to numerous military conflicts that brought untold sufferings to the

peoples: nation states were established and overseas colonies acquired, both by force of arms. Numerous theories justifying the increasing consolidation of state power and wars served to provide ideological support for this process. The principles of "national interest" formulated by Machiavelli (1469-1527) in *The Prince* became widely current in those times.

In the latter years of the sixteenth century and the early years of the seventeenth century national consolidation and the rise of the bourgeoisie in Europe speeded up the emergence of a national consciousness, giving rise at the same time to nationalism. Thus, the geography text-books published in France between 1631 and 1646, insisted that France should restore the frontiers of ancient Gaul.[1] Military victory became an organic part of the doctrine of national interest, which was also supported by the members of the Third Estate. Most typical in this respect were the views of Jean Bodin, who devoted a great deal of attention to matters of war and peace in treating the principles of state sovereignty and international economic relations. In *Answer to the Paradoxes of Maltrois* (1568), he presented a most original concept of free trade, which he considered to be the most effective means of ensuring international peace. But in his *Republic* (1576), the idea was implicit that external wars to repel an enemy attack were necessary if they were in the national interests, that war was the best means of preserving the state since it distracted the people from revolts, uprisings and civil strife, and created internal unity, and even that war was perfectly justified if it was waged by a ruler for gain or expediency.[2]

These ideas were taken a stage further by the French economist Antoine de Montchrétien in his *Treatise on Political Economy* (1615), which represented an appeal for protectionism addressed to the French Government. Montchrétien includes military glory and territorial power among the conditions necessary for economic prosperity.

However, the wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had a decidedly adverse influence on the development of Europe. The Thirty Years War alone brought devastation and ruin to a large part of the continent. The bourgeoisie were thus interested in seeing to it that peace was preserved in order that industry might flourish and home and foreign trade might

---

[1] R. Mousnier, *Les XVI^e et XVII^e siécles*, Paris, 1961, tome 4, p. 190.
[2] Jean Bodin, *Six livres de la République*, Paris, 1580, p. 755.

develop. This was what moved bourgeois thinkers to seek ways of limiting conflicts, and to analyse the causes of war. Yet there was an overwhelming tendency to regard war as inevitable. It was at this period, indeed, that the following view expressed by Luigi da Porto at the beginning of the sixteenth century came into its own, the theory that "peace brings riches, riches pride, pride wrath, wrath war, war poverty, poverty rises mildness, mildness peace, peace riches, etc."[1]

Since war was considered inevitable, the majority of bourgeois thinkers in the sixteenth century were concerned not only with elaborating principles of international law, but also with the criticism of war from humanitarian standpoints.

Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466-1536) was one of the most ardent champions of peace, with his impassioned appeals for Christendom to refrain from the folly of bloodshed and thereby set a good example to the rest of mankind.

Honoré Bonet, writing in the second half of the sixteenth century, appealed for less brutality in war. His disciple Christine de Pisan was only prepared to accept wars that were fought in order to redress an injustice and even then deplored brutality of any sort being practised.

The greatest contribution to the elaboration of various aspects of international law in the latter part of the sixteenth century was made by Francisco da Vittoria, a professor of the University of Salamanca, who, while considering war an evil, looked upon peace as an unattainable ideal. Of particular interest was his idea that the European nations, forming an equal whole since they were interdependent upon one another, should strive to abolish injustice in their relations with one another, and form a "republic of humanity".[2]

The appeal for peace was developed by Sebastian Franck (1499-1542), a representative of the democratic trend of the Reformation. In his *Kriegbuchlein des Friedens*[3], Franck reminds people that God commands them not to be wrathful without good reason, and declares that it is not for man to concern himself with increasing and strengthening his armies

---

[1] J. R. Hale, "War and Public Opinion in Renaissance Italy", *Italian Renaissance Studies*, London, 1960, p. 101.

[2] E. Nys, *Etudes de droit internationale*, 1896, pp. 321-23; M. R. Vesnitch, *Deux précurseurs français du pacifisme et l'arbitrage internationale*, Paris, 1911, p. 37.

[3] S. Franck, "Kriegbuchlein des Friedens", in the book by K. Raumer, *Ewiger Friede*, Freiburg-München, 1953.

and arms, since the Almighty alone knows when it is necessary to defend Him. The fact that he invokes God, does not make Franck's arguments acquire an abstract, purely religious character. His religious phraseology was normal for the Middle Ages and suggests the idea that if man refrains from settling earthly conflicts by force of arms, there will be no room for war to the glory of God, and "long, truly eternal peace" will reign on earth. Moreover, Franck associated the triumph of peace on earth with the triumph of social justice, recognising the right of the common people to rise up against their masters. Yet his dream of peace was not backed up by any positive programme for action.

In the seventeenth century, when the idea of a union of states was being debated, its authors—William Penn, Lilienfeld, Saint-Pierre and others—claimed that their idea stemmed from *le Grand dessein* of Henri IV of France. Some historians are of the opinion that the Duc de Sully—the real author of the Grand Design—borrowed the idea of a union of states and arbitration from E. Crucé.[1] Actually, the Grand Design can really only be considered to embody a plan for eternal peace on the strength of the literary tradition created by such thinkers of the seventeenth century and the Enlightenment as William Penn, Saint-Pierre and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The latter were dazzled both by the "peaceful" phraseology in which the plan was couched and by the implications that could be drawn from it—which acquired common currency in the seventeenth century and were clearly used by Sully for demagogical purposes—and by the legend of Henry IV's authorship of the plan, which they accepted at its face value. In actual fact, Sully's plan was for a military-political alliance of the states of Western Europe, and there are no grounds whatsoever for regarding it as a plan for eternal peace. Nevertheless, it is impossible to overlook its importance in view of the considerable influence it had on later thinkers like Penn and Rousseau.

Bourgeois international law was further developed in the 17th century in the works of Grotius, and, later, of Samuel von Pufendorf and Emerich von Vattel. Numerous theories arose of the important influence of war and peace on the development of society, and of just and unjust wars, and attempts were made to study the economic causes of war and ways of limiting

---

[1] Ch. Pfister, "Les Economies royales de Sully, et le Grand dessein de Henri IV", *Revue Historique*, 1894, tome 56, p. 330.

military conflicts and maintaining peaceful development for long periods.

A book published in Paris in 1623 is of exceptional interest in this connection. It had the rather ponderous title *The New Cyneas, or Discourse of the Occasions and Means to Establish a General Peace, and the Liberty of Commerce Throughout the Whole World. To the Monarchs and Sovereign Princes of the Present Time.*[1] The author, E. Crucé, in setting forth the main ideas of his peace programme insists that he is moved exclusively by love for his native land and expresses the hopes and fears of all honest people in France. He believes that the achievement of peace and stability at home is not the whole task, and that peace abroad is far more important. It is to the latter problem that Crucé's book is mainly devoted.

What is the reasonable basis for the creation of the peaceful community of nations? Crucé considers it to be the natural right of men to life and prosperity, based on their natural unity and equality. Natural rights, the laws of nature are to apply to all and sundry, irrespective of their importance. "The sun casts its light on gold or mud equally. Waters flow for all men. God protects the life of the most insignificant creature. Why then should rulers set themselves apart from the common people?" All men should submit to the same laws because they are by their nature an indivisible whole, since man is a social being, and cannot but take other people into account and pay attention to his fellow men. People should live in friendship with one another.

The idea of the natural equality and unity of mankind is essentially an expression of the bourgeois theory of *natural law*, of which Grotius is generally considered to be the founder. Thus, Crucé, whose book appeared in 1623, at the time when Grotius had only just begun writing his *On the Law of War and Peace*, was to a certain extent anticipating the theory of the founder of international law which was to achieve universal recognition. It is possible that Grotius came to know of Crucé's treatise when he took refuge in Paris, where his *magnum opus* was conceived, written and published.

Of course, Crucé only expresses the concept of natural law in the most general terms and in a manner in which Divine Will plays a far larger role than in the case of Grotius. Yet, as

---

[1] E. Crucé, *Le nouveau Cynée*, Ed. by T. W. Balch, Philadelphia, 1909.

with later expounders of natural law theories, his concept was already based on the most abstract expression of law—justice.

In his criticism of war, Crucé lays the main stress on the moral principle of justice, although he shows himself to be by no means unaware of the socio-economic aspects of the problem. He points out that foreign wars are fought for glory or gain, to repair an injury or, finally, for practice in the art of war. In most cases the aim and basic causes of a war are expressed in a thirst for glory and appear most legitimate. But rulers should put an end to the dominating position of the military and should not give in to their demands to wage a senseless war. The number of troops should be limited to those needed for defence. Soldiers should be provided for so that they do not see war as an opportunity to plunder and run wild. Crucé condemns outright wars which are waged over a question of honour or purely for acquiring military experience.

Crucé also considers that wars should not be fought purely for gain, as a means of acquiring some advantage, for not only is honour very much in danger in a war, but gain is highly uncertain. Even victory does not improve the position of the victor for long, since in any case taxes, and various impositions and requisitions are increased.

This idea that the military victories of rulers are ruinous for their subjects was later splendidly developed by Jean-Jacques Rousseau in his "Judgement on Eternal Peace". "It is plain enough to all that Conquering Princes make war as much on their subjects as on their enemies, and that the position of the victor is no better than that of the vanquished. 'I have defeated the Romans,' Hannibal declared to the Carthaginians. 'Send me troops. I have imposed tribute on Italy; send me money.' This is the significance of all those Te Deums, the gay fireworks and the rejoicing of the people at the triumph of their masters."[1]

As regards the third kind of war—wars to restore a right that has been denied or to repair a wrong—Crucé's attitude is extremely contradictory. The whole difficulty, he points out, lies in the claims of monarchs who have at some stage lost part of their territory. But while disapproving of their urge for vengeance and to regain their former rights on the grounds that a kingdom is not to be compared to a normal inheritance—and

[1] J.-J. Rousseau, "Jugement sur la paix perpétuelle", *Collection complète des oeuvres*, Genève, 1782, tome 28.

therefore, unlike da Vittoria and Grotius, appearing to regard this kind of war to be unjustified—Crucé at the same time considers that a monarch has the right to reparation for injury and to the restoration of his rights, not by war but only by arbitration.

For this purpose Crucé suggests that an international tribunal should be set up for the peaceful settlement of conflicts.

On the basis of the assumption that all men are members of a single family and possessed of reason, Crucé holds that neither political discord nor religious dissent can prevent people from establishing eternal peace as long as their actions are guided by reason. And since he is convinced that monarchs are judicious and conscious of their duty, he considers that the establishment of universal peace depends on them.

By consistently developing the idea of the unity of mankind and natural equality, Crucé widened the scope of the traditional ideal of European peace to include all other nations. Universal peace would lead to wide acceptance of international co-operation and would serve first and foremost to promote world trade.

Such, in general terms, was Crucé's programme for universal peace. Utopian though it was, it was nevertheless a bright manifestation of French humanism.

As the seventeenth century advanced, more and more voices were heard condemning war. Vauban, La Bruyére, Fenelon, and Houdar de la Motte all embarked on the quest for ways of preventing military conflicts. The outstanding Czech philosopher Jan Amos Comenius devoted many years of his life to a comprehensive analysis of ideas on peace. He placed the question of safeguarding peace before the rulers of Europe in his treatise, *Only One Thing Is Necessary*, which he addressed to those taking part in the international conference at Breda, convened to work out terms for a peace treaty between England and Holland, which he called "The Herald of Peace".

His major work, *General Advice to the Human Race, and Above All to the Scholars and the Devout Rulers of Europe, on the Correcting of Human Affairs*, was a comprehensive criticism of feudal relations, characterised throughout by an ardent desire for peace in all spheres of social life—in the internal affairs of nations, in relations between different religious confessions and especially in international relations.

Comenius regarded the chief cause of foreign war or civil strife to lie in differences of opinion arising from human ignorance. Thus, an equal education would be a guarantee of peace

and prosperity, since man's intrinsic rights are based on a common nature, and identical needs and interests. He advances the idea of "Pansophia" (universal wisdom) underlying the unity of the human race, and sees it as the point of departure for the transformation of society. An important role is to be attributed to an international gathering of scholars ("The Commune of Light") with the task of developing education and knowledge both in Europe and in the "overseas possessions", i.e., the colonies. Improvements in education would not only promote the development of science, but would also serve to stimulate greater co-operation among peoples. International unity would ensure peace and security. That is why rulers should proceed from truth and justice in their government and not impose their will on their neighbours by force of arms. War should be completely excluded in a society ruled by reason. To preserve peace, a universal state body—which Comenius refers to variously as a peace tribunal, a universal Senate, an Areopagus court and the directory of the powers—would have the task of safeguarding the unity of peoples and ensuring peaceful relations between them. All peoples (including the peoples of Asia, Africa and America) should take part in the formation of this international organisation. Later, similar separate organisations would be set up for each continent.

Unfortunately, the plan of the great Czech humanist was not published in his lifetime. Yet, even had it appeared, it could not possibly have been implemented, any more than could the plan of his younger contemporary, the great William Penn.

William Penn (1644-1718) published *An Essay Towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe by the Establishment of an European Diet, Parliament or Estates* in 1693 when a general war was ravaging the continent. His idea is for the creation of a union of states, but unlike Crucé, the union he proposes was only to involve the countries of Western Europe, Russia and Turkey, and was of an exclusively military-political nature.

Penn enumerates and dispels the various doubts that might arise in connection with his plan. What should be done if a ruler refuses to accept a decision of the Diet? The most powerful state, Penn replies, would be forced to submit to combined pressure by the other countries. How was corruption to be avoided? To begin with, only honest and worthy representatives should be sent to the Diet, and to make double sure their actions would be subject to strict control. Would not the realisation of such a programme tend to weaken the soldiers and

make them incapable of doing their duty in time of need? This could be avoided if the soldiers were given appropriate training. Thus, the soldiers should be taught the arts and sciences, which would help to make them socially useful. Lastly, would not the monarchies lose their sovereignty? Not at all: "... States retain their former sovereignty, but now none has any advantages over the others. And if this be called weakening of their power, then it is only so in the sense that a large fish will no longer be able to devour the small and every state is equally protected from injustice and unable to wreak unjustice." Penn's plan is based on the principles of international law and strives to turn Europe from a loose collection of states into a coherent system of states. It goes without saying, this plan had absolutely no practical influence on the political development of Europe.

Such was the fate of many programmes for peace that arose in the early eighteenth century. Of these, the one that achieved the greatest fame at the time was the plan of l'Abbé de Saint-Pierre (1658-1743), a representative of the early Enlightenment and throughout his life an ardent champion of peace. In 1712, he published his *Essay on the Achievement of Eternal Peace in Europe*,[1] which was followed by his major work, the three-volume *Plan for Eternal Peace in Europe*. Twelve years later came an abridged version of the *Plan* and there was a constant stream of letters and minor works all serving the same aim—to substantiate the basic ideas contained in his plan. His persistent propagation of the idea of peace gained him a wide audience and a great reputation with the progressive minds of his age.

Like Comenius, Saint-Pierre was convinced that only education could guarantee peaceful development. But until such time as education had been made available to all, eternal peace should be achieved by the creation of an international coalition. Saint-Pierre invoked the Grand Design of Henri IV, but the alliance he proposed differed from the latter both in its aims and in the manner in which they were to be realised. His plan was based on acceptance of existing political orders and the existing norms of international relations. All matters of disagreement arising between the member states of the coalition should be decided exclusively by means of talks. Moreover, he placed far greater responsibility on the monarchs for the peace of Europe.

[1] Charles-Irénée, l'Abbé de Saint-Pierre, *Projet pour rendre la paix perpétuelle en Europe*, Utrecht, 1713-17; abrégé du *Projet de paix perpétuelle*, Rotterdam, 1729.

There is no doubt that the idea of a political coalition of the states of feudal-absolutist Europe acquired a largely reactionary character as soon as it was treated in practical terms, since it served as a convenient formula for expressing the aspirations of the feudal monarchs for European hegemony. Thus, D'Argenson, who considered himself a disciple of Saint-Pierre, would have France in the role of organiser of a peaceful coalition of European states. Indeed, Saint-Pierre's plan was so unrealistic for the Europe of those times that he himself had grave doubts as to its possibility of success.

However, despite their utopian nature, the anti-military writings of the Renaissance and early Enlightenment were undoubtedly progressive in content. Their great merit lay in their comprehensive criticism of war. The coalition of states they propounded had the single aim of maintaining enduring peace. Their support for the sovereignty and unity of the member states was accompanied by boundless faith in the sense of duty and justice of the absolute monarchs of Europe. They had not come to suspect that the absolute monarchs were totally incapable of putting an end to war or that the union of peoples in the interests of peace was impossible in the framework of an antagonistic social order.

In the 16th and 17th centuries, when the absolute monarchies embodied the process of centralisation of state power and the consolidation of nation states throughout Europe in opposition to the centrifugal forces of feudalism, it was quite understandable that the bourgeois humanists should have subscribed to such utopian views. However, as the crisis of the feudal absolutist system deepened as the eighteenth century wore on, the thinkers of the late Enlightenment were quite unable to accept any form of appeal to the good will of monarchs. They came instead to the conclusion that absolutism was in fact the root of war.

It was symptomatic that Voltaire should have been so scornful of Saint-Pierre's plan for idealising the role of the monarchs of Europe in the creation of a peaceful coalition of states. Voltaire abhorred war, but believed that Europe was quite incapable of putting an end to it, and considered Saint-Pierre's plan a chimera.

Voltaire was highly critical of the idea of controlling wars by the principles of international law, as really doing no more than legalise military depredation. "I know the law of peace very well," he wrote. "It consists in keeping one's word and

recognising the natural rights of others. But I do not know the law of war. A code of laws of murders permitted in war seems a peculiar invention to me. I hope that in the near future we shall be given a collection of laws permitting highway robbery".[1]

Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) supported Saint-Pierre's criticism of war and his demand for universal peace. He even published a short summary of Saint-Pierre's plan (1761) and brought out a pamphlet entitled "Judgement on Eternal Peace" in which he declared himself in favour of the creation of an international peace organisation.[2] The advantages that a peaceful union of states would bring to each nation separately and to Europe as a whole were so great and obvious that it would have been enough to set it up for one day to ensure that it lasted for ever. However, the methods which had hitherto been suggested for the realisation of such a union seemed to Rousseau to be totally unrealistic. Saint-Pierre's plan was too good to be accepted. For can one really expect from monarchs, who boast their right to start wars when they think fit, to agree to submit to an international court? Of course not, for all the activities of monarchs and their ministers are directed towards increasing the power of their states abroad and strengthening their own absolute power. There is a close relationship between war and conquest on the one hand and the progress of despotism on the other.

Eternal peace can only be attained when personal interests coincide with the common interest. In a society in which the rulers oppress their subjects nobody is interested in preserving peace. Changes must be brought about within the framework of the state, despotism must be abolished and political life made more democratic. Only then will it be possible to ensure enduring peace. Thus, Rousseau introduced to the concept of peaceful coexistence the idea that universal peace was linked with the need for fundamental political changes in society.

Another confirmed opponent of war was Montesquieu. His ideal was a federative republic endowed with wide powers in foreign affairs and the right to intervene in internal disturbances in any of the member states. He insisted that the federa-

---

[1] F. M. Voltaire, "De la paix perpétuelle", in *Collection complète des œuvres*, Genève-Paris, tome 28, p. 105.

[2] See *Collection complète des oeuvres de J.-J. Rousseau*, tome 23, pp. 3-52.

tion should consist of states with an identical form of government and was in favour of this being the republican system.

Diderot shared the view of Montesquieu that a single form of government was an essential prerequisite for eternal peace. Like Rousseau he saw the connection between a policy of conquest and the strengthening of despotism and held that only universal progress towards freedom and the abolition of monarchy would create the conditions in which international military conflicts would be replaced by legal conflicts.

Anti-military ideas also developed in German philosophy. Beginning with the appearance of Franck's "Kriegbuchlein des Friedens", German thinkers embarked on a ceaseless quest for peace. Leibniz, writing at the end of the 17th century, was an ardent champion of the cause of universal peace. He proposed the creation of a union of European nations, and suggested that in case of conflicts arising France should be the arbiter and her armies should be used for the purpose of resolving them. He thought very highly of the plans of Crucé and Saint-Pierre.

Wolf and Lessing were also interested in Saint-Pierre's treatise, but it was Kant, Fichte and Herder who enriched the idea of eternal peace with new content.

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) was the first to brilliantly predict the inevitability of a union of nations. Human nature under the impact of wars and the burden of maintaining armies, and the poverty which was to be found in every country even in time of peace, would induce people after numerous devastations, revolutions and complete exhaustion to listen to the voice of Reason and form an international alliance where each state, be it ever so small, could expect its independence and rights to be guaranteed not by its own strength but by that powerful union of peoples.

In 1795, Kant published his famous treatise *Towards Eternal Peace*, which contained many extremely penetrating ideas on international relations.

Kant was by no means a pacifist. He held war to be perfectly lawful when a nation was forced to resort to it in order to defend its independence. But while admitting that war was lawful and just in certain cases, he could not accept a state of affairs whereby war remained a constant threat in international affairs, and was convinced of the feasibility of establishing enduring peace between the nations.[1]

[1] I. Kant, *Zum ewigen Frieden*, Königsberg, 1795.

Many bourgeois writers today distort Kant's idea of a federation of free states bound together by a covenant forbidding war out of all recognition (M. Adler, K. Friedrich and others). Attempts are made to show that Kant held that national sovereignty inevitably leads to war and that universal supranational government can ensure peace. American interpreters of Kant modernise the concept of "federation" as used by him, giving it quite a different meaning from the one he intended.

However, an unbiased analysis of the content of the three "final articles" of the treatise, in which Kant advises how peace should be maintained once it has been achieved, shows that the organisation of states he envisaged was neither a universal monarchy nor a universal republic but a league of free, sovereign states. Kant speaks of a *league* of nations, not a state of nations.

In Article One Kant describes the best form of civil government for each of the component states, and limits the right to universal citizenship to the right of the foreigner to hospitality among other peoples. As for the principle of federation, Kant gave it the same meaning as his predecessors: his federation of free states meant combining efforts for the attainment of universal, eternal peace, and was by no means directed against the sovereignty of the individual states. Thus all attempts by contemporary ideologists of cosmopolitanism to present Kant as their precursor and an advocate of a universal supranational government are totally unfounded.

It was the cherished ideal of Herder (1744-1803) to see his people living in peace and friendship with other nations, and he expressed great admiration for those who had made a contribution to spreading the idea of peace. One of his "Letters for the Promotion of Humanity"[1] was specially devoted to Saint-Pierre, although he had somewhat different ideas from the latter as to how eternal peace should be brought about. While Saint-Pierre, and Kant also, saw the matter essentially in legal terms, for Herder it was above all a moral issue, a question of moral education. Herder held that an agreement concluded in a hostile world could not serve as a guarantee of peace: only the spread of universal justice and humanity could promote the improvement of morals and at the same time lessen military conflicts.

Herder made several suggestions as to how the task of edu-

[1] J. G. Herder, *Briefe zur Beforderung der Humanität*, Berlin, 1793-97.

cating people in the spirit of justice and humanity might best be accomplished. What characterised him was his appeal to the masses as the ones who suffered most from war. The peoples should take the matter into their own hands and force the rulers to accept their demands for peace.

Humanitarian ideas of universal peace occupied a worthy place in the Russian Enlightenment. Mikhail Lomonosov expressed hopes that war might be abolished; Roman Tsebrikov (1763-1817) and Ippolit Bogdanovich (1743-1803) propagated the ideas of peace, and in the 1760s Semyon Desnitsky wrote in favour of universal peace.

Yakov Kozelsky, who was familiar with the theories of the French Enlightenment and especially with the works of Rousseau, held that peace could only be achieved in a society where the interests of rulers and subjects were in harmony. Criticising wars of annexation, Kozelsky maintained that it was the statesmen striving to enrich themselves at the expense of other nations who should be held responsible for war crimes.

Alexander Radishchev held that the way for the people to free themselves forever from the great evil of war was through revolution and the reorganisation of society. Vasily Malinovsky, in his *Reflections on Peace and War*, proposed a plan for the creation of an international peace organisation. Particularly interesting is his idea of applying sanctions, up to and including the use of military force, against disturbers of international peace.

It was not only political thinkers who examined the problem of international peace in the eighteenth century: the physiocrat economists also voiced support for the idea of enduring peace, albeit from a bourgeois standpoint. They appealed for the universal strengthening of natural law as the basis for international relations with a view to the creation of favourable conditions for the development of trade and other international ties.

Thus, bourgeois thinkers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries examined the idea of peace in three basic aspects: firstly, peace through a union of states; secondly, peace through social harmony, and, thirdly, peace as the result of a just social order. However, the appeal for the institution of the harmonious state based upon Reason, excluding the need for war, never involved recognition of the need for the revolutionary destruction of the social order based on private ownership, so that in fact the practical effect of all such bourgeois criticism

of war and advocation of peace was limited to hastening the passing of feudal institutions in Europe.

There is no denying that criticism of feudal institutions and absolutism had a progressive humanist content. However, the dreams of the bourgeois humanists were not destined to come true either in their own day or in the period that immediately followed. The triumph of the bourgeoisie over feudalism resulted not in the institution of the harmonious state based upon Reason its ideologists preached, but in the emergence of the capitalist order, which brought mankind even greater social contradictions than before, even greater exploitation of man by man, economic crises, unemployment, poverty and even greater strife and bloodshed. Engels wrote, describing the crisis of the ideals of the Enlightenment: "The state based upon reason completely collapsed.... The promised eternal peace was turned into an endless war of conquest."[1]

[1] Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 303.

# II
# THE ORIGINS AND ESSENCE OF WAR

## Chapter III

# THE DIALECTICS OF WAR AND PEACE

### The Concept of War

A scientific definition of politics, war and peace as social categories is an essential prelude to the correct understanding and solution of current international political problems. An irrefutable explanation of these categories in historical and sociological terms has been provided by Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

War is a many-sided and fluent concept, and those scholars who fail to reckon with its dialectical nature and persist in treating it in terms of metaphysical, immutable principles are bound to find themselves in an impasse. Thorough-going analysis of the essence of war in all its major aspects was made on the basis of the dialectical method of investigation. The first step in adopting the dialectical approach to analysis of war as a socio-political phenomenon was taken by the German military theoretician Clausewitz. But it was Marx, Engels and Lenin who played the major role in revealing the true content of war employing the dialectical method, which enabled them to avoid the subjective, eclectical approach typical of bourgeois sociologists past and present.

Marxism-Leninism rejects dogmatic views of war as an absolute evil and on the basis of concrete analysis draws a distinction between just and unjust wars, reactionary and progressive, revolutionary wars, and so on. Only a historical approach to the analysis of wars relying on dialectically fluent and flexible concepts can adequately reflect the different objec-

tive content of wars, their qualitative variety. According to metaphysical theories, war appears as an eternal and immutable category. Such an approach is clearly unhistorical, and fails to keep in sight the true essence of war, its social, political and class content.

The Marxist-Leninist approach to the analysis of wars is based on interfusion of history and logic, which makes it possible to reveal the specific nature of a specific war. Lenin put it as follows: "There are wars and wars. We must be clear as to what historical conditions have given rise to the war, what classes are waging it, and for what ends. Unless we grasp this, all our talk about the war will necessarily be utterly futile, engendering more heat than light."[1] And again: "We Marxists differ from both pacifists and anarchists in that we deem it necessary to study each war historically (from the standpoint of Marx's dialectical materialism) and separately."[2]

Analysis of class contradictions and class policies is central in the historical study of wars according to the dialectical method. The dialectics of the development of class policies is the key to understanding the essence of war as a socio-historical category.

The development of a scientific theory of the essence and causes of wars began not with recognition of "eternal laws" of human antagonisms, but with the determining of the political factors that have given rise to a particular war. From the standpoint of the dialectics politics are the cornerstone of the theory of war. It was to the dialectical materialist approach that we owe the first successful attempt to scientifically determine the origin and causes of all wars in the history of human society.

As distinct from the metaphysical approach which treated politics and war as completely opposite concepts, Clausewitz defined war from the standpoint of the Hegelian dialectic, according to which concepts are fluent and interfuse. Clausewitz's central thesis was that the concepts of war and politics, far from being static, interfuse. He was the first military theoretician to employ the dialectical method in the analysis of war.

The success that could be achieved by adopting the dialectical approach to the analysis of war was made particularly clear by Clausewitz's definition of war as the continuation of politics

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 399.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 21, p. 299.

by other, violent means. "War," he wrote, "is none other than *the continuation of the policy of the state by other means.* If this point of view is everywhere firmly adopted it will introduce more unity into examination of the question and will help make everything more easily comprehensible."[1] This definition testifies to the triumph of the dialectical approach over the metaphysical approach. That, indeed, was how Marx, Engels and Lenin evaluated the formula when they applied the dialectical method to the analysis of particular wars.

Nevertheless, Clausewitz's definition of war differs essentially from the definition we find in Marxist-Leninist theory. Clausewitz, employing Hegel's idealist dialectic, was only able to give an idealist definition of politics. For him politics combines and harmonises all the interests of internal government and social relations, including questions of humanism and so on. This was the fundamental weakness of his philosophy. His incorrect, abstract definition of politics prevented him from revealing the class nature of war as a social category. Nonetheless, his ideas are still important today as an antidote to narrow, philistine views on the nature and causes of war that are widely current.

Many contemporary bourgeois military theoreticians refuse to accept Clausewitz's correct dialectical theory of war as the continuation of politics by violent means. In defining the nature of war, they adopt a subjective metaphysical approach that masks the connection between war and politics. They strongly oppose the scientific analysis of the class politics of imperialism and refuse to recognise the connection between imperialist wars and the imperialist policies of the capitalist countries.

Subjectivism and mysticism underlie the approach of many contemporary bourgeois theoreticians to the problem of war. They treat war as something eternal and as an unsolved mystery of social life. Thus, the military historian Hans von Manteuffel, former nazi general, holds that wars constantly break out as a result of continuous conflict between demoniac ideas. In his opinion, "an unknown force... since 1914—apparently for superior metaphysical reasons—has plunged peoples and nations into one disaster after another"[2]. General Guderian ascribes the outbreak of the two world wars to the mysterious "will of

---

[1] Karl von Clausewitz, *Vom Krieg*, Berlin, 1957, S. 6.

[2] H. von Manteuffel, *Bilanz des zweiten Weltkrieges. Erkenntnisse und Verpflichtungen für der Zukunft*, Hamburg, 1953, pp. 463-64.

Fate": "By the will of Fate my generation took part in two world wars. . . ."[1]

The English military historian Fuller also gives a mystical, abstract explanation for the occurrence of wars. "*From whence come wars and fighting among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?*

"In these words of St. James is the answer which the nations can only reject at their peril. It is in the envies, greeds and fears of men that the roots of war are to be found."[2] In other words, Fuller sees war as a permanent, immutable social category resulting from the antagonistic nature of human relations.

We find this same subjective, eclectic approach underlying the views of the English military specialist E. J. Kingston-McCloughry on the content of modern war. He chooses to single out ideological contradictions as the sole source of modern military conflicts. "Perhaps the most profound change lies in the motive round which nations now manoeuvre and prepare for war. No longer is the motive of war simply to gain new territories, resources and materials. Today, a prime feature of war or threat of war is a world-wide struggle over ideologies: a struggle in respective ways of life which is something like a reversion to the wars of the crusaders. . . ."[3]

Marxism-Leninism, employing the dialectical approach, makes a thorough, comprehensive study of the connection between war and politics. Perhaps the most striking feature of Leninist dialectics is that it is so concrete, and reflects all the real contradictions of social life. This can be seen very clearly in Lenin's concrete historical analysis of war, where everything is treated in terms of social, economic and class relations, and placed on a firm material basis. Lenin's approach revolutionised the very concept of politics, stripping it of idealist dogmatism and abstraction, and placing it on firm concrete historical, class foundations. Opposing all attempts to vulgarise the concept of war and detach it from politics, he made a thoroughgoing historical analysis of the dialectic of this central category. Clausewitz had overlooked what was to become an essential element of the Marxist-Leninist analysis of war—historical analysis of class policies.

---

[1] Vincenz Müller, *Ich fand das wahre Vaterland*, Berlin, 1963, p. 471.

[2] J. F. C. Fuller, *The Second World War 1939-1945*, London, 1948, p. 412.

[3] E. J. Kingston-McCloughry, *Global Strategy*, New York, 1957, p. 26.

Marx, Engels and Lenin evolved their theories of the true nature of war on the basis of their analysis of numerous wars in the conditions of capitalism and imperialism. Unlike Clausewitz, they regarded politics not as an expression of the abstract interests of society as a whole, but as an expression of definite class interests. Their main aim was thus to reveal the political content of a war and the connection between its aims and the material interests of a particular class. Lenin maintained that war and politics were not to be opposed and contrasted to one another as the metaphysicists held, but that a war represented the continuation and consummation of the policy of a particular class. "The Marxist viewpoint," he wrote, "requires that in each individual case we define the political content of the war.

"But what determines the political content of a war?

"Every war is only the continuation of policy. What kind of policy is being continued in the present war?"[1]

Lenin shared the dialectical viewpoint of Marx and Engels, who saw war as the natural outcome and continuation of the policies of the particular states involved and the various classes within those states at the time. In his own words, "all wars are inseparable from the political systems that engender them".[2]

Refuting the view of those dogmatists and eclectics who were inclined to see war as a casual, chance conflict between states, Lenin wrote: "How, then, can we disclose and define the 'substance' of a war? War is the continuation of a policy. Consequently, we must examine the policy pursued prior to the war, the policy that led to and brought about the war."[3] It was only by adopting the dialectical method that it proved possible to reveal the true essence of a war and the development of the class policies that had engendered it.

This does not mean that the dialectic draws no distinction between the concepts of "war" and "politics". A policy can be peaceful, while a war means that the course of peace has been abandoned for other, violent methods. When a war breaks out, a policy is still being pursued but by different, military methods. Lenin expressed this as follows: "The policy which a given state, a given class within that state, pursued for a long time before the war is inevitably continued by that

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 196.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 24, p. 400.
[3] Ibid., Vol. 23, p. 33.

same class during the war, the form of action alone being changed."[1]

Failure to understand the dialectic of the interdependency and interfusion of war and politics is the metaphysical gnoseological foundation from which grow numerous empty definitions of war that explain absolutely nothing. Such definitions, moreover, lead to crude distortions of the concept and mask the class essence of war. Lenin was most insistent on this point: "How can a war be accounted for without considering its bearing on the preceding policy of the given state, of the given system of states, the given classes? I repeat: this is a basic point which is constantly overlooked. Failure to understand it makes nine-tenths of all war discussions mere wrangling, so much verbiage."[2]

When people like Kautsky, Plekhanov and many others tried to define the imperialist war (the First World War) in this way, reducing it to the secondary question of who started it, they were unable to explain the real essence of the war since they failed to pay due attention to the policies of the leading imperialist powers in the years preceding the war and evaded its real causes, ignoring which classes were waging it and with what political objects. Lenin criticised such mistaken assessments as follows: "The mistake and falsehood of popular literature on war is the evasion of this question; it ignores this question and presents the matter as if there had been no class struggle, as if two countries lived amicably, until one attacked the other, and the attacked had been defending itself. This is vulgar reasoning in which there is no shadow of objective truth."[3] Lenin insisted that the most important feature of the imperialist war was "the striving of the capitalists of *every* nation for profits and the exploitation of others, and the striving of the Great Powers to partition the world and 'enslave' weaker nations".[4]

Thus the real objective content of the First World War was only revealed by means of concrete comprehensive dialectical analysis of the policies that had led to it. Lenin chastised the eclectic theoreticians who refused to employ the dialectical method of cognition in analysing the causes and essence of war.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 400.
[2] Ibid., p. 402.
[3] Ibid., Vol. 26, p. 266.
[4] Ibid., Vol. 21, p. 384.

"The philistine does not realise that war is 'the continuation of policy', and consequently limits himself to the formula that 'the enemy has attacked us', 'the enemy has invaded my country', without stopping to think *what issues* are at stake in the war, *which* classes are waging it, and with *what* political objects....

"For the philistine the important thing is *where* the armies stand, who is winning *at the moment*. For the Marxist the important thing is *what issues* are at stake in *this* war."[1]

Attempts to treat war purely as an armed struggle considered in isolation cannot possibly produce a scientific definition of its essence. This was the way Kautsky approached the First World War, regarding it as an armed conflict between peoples and states, some of them attacking and the others defending themselves.

Such a definition allows little or no distinction to be drawn between a war and an armed attack by highway robbers or a shooting match between bandits. After all, either of these are forms of armed struggle, with those attacking and those defending themselves. Lenin exposed the absurdity of this arbitrary approach to war as follows: "... Closer examination of the theoretical premises in Kautsky's reasoning will reveal the self-same idea that Clausewitz ridiculed about eighty years ago, viz., that when war breaks out, all historically created political relations between nations and classes cease and that a totally new situation arises! There are 'simply' those that attack and those that are defending themselves, 'simply' the warding off of the 'enemies of the fatherland'!"[2]

Lenin insisted that politics must be taken into account in determining the real essence of any war and opposed the widespread fallacy that war could be treated without reference to class policy, "as being a simple attack that disturbs the peace, and is then followed by restoration of the peace thus disturbed, as much as to say: 'They had a fight, then they made up!' This is a grossly ignorant view."[3]

Let us take as an example the war that the United States is at present waging against the people of Vietnam. It is quite impossible to arrive at an understanding of the true essence of this imperialist war without first analysing the imperialist policy

---

[1] Ibid., Vol. 23, p. 33.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 21, p. 220.
[3] Ibid., Vol. 24, pp. 399-400.

of the USA. The same applies to any other war launched by the imperialists.

Reactionary bourgeois theoreticians view the war in Vietnam in quite a different light. They arbitrarily contrast the war itself and the class and national policy of the Vietnamese people who have taken up arms fighting to oppose American imperialism, trying to present it as a "lawless" insurrection by subversive elements against the "lawful" government. The real essence of the war is an attempt by American imperialism, the local military and reactionary bourgeoisie and landowners, in pursuit of their own class interests, economic and political, to crush the national liberation struggle of the Vietnamese people.

The dialectic of historical development in the twentieth century clearly demonstrates that however different the aims pursued in wars may be, they represent in every case a continuation of a particular class policy by violent means.

A war in which a nation is engaged cannot be separated from its policy, let alone contrasted with it, for every war is a link in one political chain, an extension and continuation of the policy of a particular class and state at a given time.

Criticising metaphysical methods of investigating the causes of the First World War, Lenin wrote: "We must take the whole policy of the entire system of European states in their economic and political interrelations if we are to understand how the present war steadily and inevitably grew out of this system."[1]

From this it can be seen what a tremendous importance the analysis of the whole system of international economic and political relations has in determining the true essence of a war.

Lenin continued to develop his concept of war with analysis of political development as a many-sided whole.

Although war is a general concept, each war is qualitatively different in content from all others. Thus, it only genuinely became a general concept when it ceased to be an abstract concept of war in general and became a comprehensive scientific concept. The dialectical method is called upon to make a thorough concrete study of the objective class content of politics as the fundamental concept underlying the system of development of scientific categories in question. The Marxist-Leninist analysis of policy concepts differs fundamentally from the

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 401.

views of dialectical idealists, from the one-sided views of the eclectics and from the moribund systems of the modern scholastics and dogmatists.

Lenin defines the essence of a war by means of concrete analysis of the class policy of particular classes at a given time. If the policy preceding a war was imperialist then the war it has led to must be qualified as imperialist. If the policy was one of national liberation, then the war it has led to is to be defined as a war of national liberation.

A comprehensive scientific classification of wars can only be produced on the basis of analysis of their class nature.

The adoption of the scientific dialectical method of analysis made it possible, for example, to determine the reactionary, colonialist nature of many wars of the post-war period—such as those waged by Britain in Malaysia and the Middle East, by France in Algeria, by Portugal in Angola, and so on—since these wars were fought with a view to crushing the national liberation movement in colonies and dependent countries. On the other hand, the wars waged by the Chinese, Indonesian, Egyptian and Algerian peoples for their freedom, against the imperialists, were just and progressive.

In the post-war period, the reactionary forces of the world imperialist bourgeoisie headed by the United States have been threatening mankind with the menace of a world nuclear war. But the introduction of nuclear weapons does not alter the essential class nature of war. A nuclear war on a world scale in present-day conditions can only be the outcome of the adventuristic imperialist policy of modern state-monopoly capitalism. Imperialism, which has already unleashed two colossally destructive world wars, now threatens mankind with the danger of an even more terrible catastrophe.

From a close study of the class policy of the USA, the Federal Republic of Germany, Britain and other bourgeois states in the post-war period it is quite plain that imperialism creates the threat of a third world war, a conclusion reached by Marxists-Leninists on the basis of a strictly objective analysis of all the basic antagonisms and conflicts of our time. It is the policy of war and aggression being pursued in the interests of monopoly capital that could lead to a third world war.

Unlike other imperialist wars, a world thermonuclear war represents a serious threat to the whole of mankind, and could cause the destruction of the centres of world culture and hundreds of millions of lives. At the same time, it would mark the

end of the adventuristic policy of all the reactionary forces of world imperialism.

The Marxist-Leninist dialectic is opposed to abstract views on the essence of war, and insists on a social, class definition of individual wars. Marx, Engels and Lenin sharply condemned attempts by bourgeois philosophers and military theoreticians to substitute references to biological, psychological, natural and other factors for the social definition of war.

Intelligent application of the dialectic to scientific study of the category of war makes possible a deeper and more comprehensive analysis of the mechanics of development of this form of expression of social conflicts, of the inner processes and essential changes affecting the nature of war.

It is to the Marxist dialectic that we owe the discovery of qualitative changes in the nature of wars. Rejecting the metaphysical approach to war as a fixed, invariable category, Lenin made a comprehensive study of the dialectical transformation of wars. The dialectical theory that concepts are dynamic and flexible opened up wide possibilities for comprehensive historical analysis of this process of transformation with regard to wars. Moreover, Lenin saw the transformation of wars as a clear demonstration of the thesis that all dividing lines in nature and society are conventional and dynamic. "That all dividing lines, both in nature and society, are conventional and dynamic, and that *every* phenomenon might, under certain conditions, be transformed into its opposite, is, of course, a basic proposition of Marxist dialectics. A national war *might* be transformed into an imperialist war *and vice versa.*"[1]

This qualitative transformation of wars into their opposite is only natural. Only dogmatic thought finds itself powerless to explain the transformation of a particular phenomenon into its opposite. According to dialectical logic a qualitative change in a class policy automatically entails a corresponding fundamental change in the essence of a war. It is in this way that Lenin explains the change that occurred in the nature of the wars of the Napoleonic era: "...The wars of the Great French Revolution began as national wars and indeed were such. They were revolutionary wars—the defence of the great revolution against a coalition of counter-revolutionary monarchies. But when Napoleon founded the French Empire and subjugated a number of big, viable and long-established national European

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 309.

states, these national wars of the French became imperialist wars and *in turn* led to wars of national liberation *against* Napoleonic imperialism."[1]

A truly scientific analysis of the essence of each of these wars, of the historical process whereby a national war is transformed into an imperialist war and vice versa necessarily involved a concrete study of the respective political situation and the objectives of the war in question.

Criticising the subjective and dogmatic approach to the problem, Lenin wrote: "Only a sophist can disregard the difference between an imperialist and a national war on the grounds that one *might* develop into the other. Not infrequently have dialectics served—and the history of Greek philosophy is an example—as a bridge to sophistry. But we remain dialecticians and we combat sophistry not by denying the possibility of transformations in general, but by analysing the *given* phenomenon in its concrete setting and development."[2]

Here is yet a further example of Lenin's analysis of wars of national liberation passing into their opposite—an imperialist war. Describing nascent Italian imperialism at the time of the First World War, he wrote: "Revolutionary-democratic Italy, i.e., revolutionary-bourgeois Italy, the Italy that cast off the yoke of Austria, the Italy of the times of Garibaldi, is changing before our very eyes into an Italy that is oppressing other peoples and plundering Turkey and Austria, an Italy of a crude, repulsively reactionary and rapacious bourgeoisie whose mouth waters at the prospect of a share in the loot."[3]

Lenin also examined the way the First World War became transformed into a civil war in Russia. He sharply criticised the lack of realism shown by those dogmatists and eclectics who refused to believe that the imperialist war could be transformed into a civil war in the age of imperialism. This subjective attitude was based on the abstract conception of war as a permanent evil and their treatment of the war as something separate from imperialist policy. Lenin's view, based on a concrete historical analysis of the age of imperialism, was that "the objective inevitability of capitalism which grew into imperialism brought about the imperialist war. The war has brought mankind to *the brink of the precipice*, to the brink of

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid., Vol. 21, pp. 357-58.

the destruction of civilisation, to the brutalisation and destruction of more millions, countless millions, of human beings.

"The only way out is through a proletarian revolution."[1]

The logic of developing social conflicts at the time of the First World War showed that the most realistic way out of these contradictions was to turn the imperialist war into its opposite—a civil war—in the interests of socialism. "The slogan of *civil war* for socialism indicates the quickest way out of the imperialist war and *links* our struggle against the war with our struggle against opportunism."[2] However, the materialist dialectic views the transformation of one war to another not as a subjective act but as a process of objective logic involving the movement of contradictions from one stage to another. "The conversion of the imperialist war into a civil war cannot be 'made', any more than a revolution can be 'made'. It *develops* out of a number of diverse phenomena, aspects, features, characteristics and consequences of the imperialist war."[3]

In the conditions attending that particular stage in Russia's development the course Lenin urged was the only path that would serve mankind's advance towards socialism. The correctness of Lenin's deduction that the imperialist war could be turned into a civil war waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie was confirmed by the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The dialectic of the developments by which the Second World War was transformed from an imperialist war into a just war of liberation against the fascist states can be seen from an analysis of the policies of the imperialist powers in the preceding period.

Marxist-Leninist analysis of the character of the Second World War shows that the ruling circles in Germany, Britain, France, the USA and Japan waged the war for world domination, and that the war was the continuation of years of imperialist rivalry in the capitalist camp. This was the real cause of the war, which began as an unjust, reactionary, imperialist war.

Only dogmatists and metaphysicists can regard the Second World War as having remained unchanged in character throughout. With the invasion of the USSR, the war assumed a

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 87.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 23, p. 26.
[3] Ibid., Vol. 21, p. 278.

new character and by virtue of the liberation struggle and the struggle of the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition became a just war, a war against fascism, a war of liberation. This was the turning-point in the dialectic of development of the Second World War.

The key to the correct scientific interpretation of the problem is to be found in analysis of the policy of the USSR before the war and in the period of the Soviet people's Great Patriotic War. Only by making this the basic point of departure can the true character of the Second World War and the causes of its transformation from an imperialist war into a just, anti-fascist war be successfully revealed. Any other approach will lead to an inextricable tangle in the jungle of scholasticism and eclecticism.

However, the phenomenon of the transformation of war must not be stretched to eclectical absurdity. As we have seen, while condemning dogmatic clichés of the impossibility of a war being transformed, Marxism-Leninism is strongly opposed to an abstract subjective approach to the process, and to the possible being confused with the real. Lenin insisted: "It is precisely in 'methodology' ... that one must distinguish the possible from the real."[1]

Dialectical materialism thus examines every instance of a war being transformed in its concrete historical context, in its organic relationship with the actual development of class politics and class contradictions in the time in question. Objective assessment of the real possibility of the transformation of a war is therefore always based on a comprehensive analysis of the nature of social forces, the content of class and national contradictions in a particular historical period. Only in this way can the objective logic of changes in the character of war be correctly assessed.

## The Scientific Approach to the Concept of Peace

Everyone believes he has a clear understanding of what peace is and how it differs from war. Everyone seems to be equally convinced that the concept of peace is the direct opposite of the

[1] Ibid., Vol. 35, p. 243.

concept of war. However, appearances are deceptive, and we are dealing here with an extremely widespread illusion. This abstract definition of war and peace as two stable poles is in fact a completely unscientific approach to the problems of peace. Dialectical materialist analysis of war and peace is in fundamental contrast of this superficial view, and shows that the mechanism of the relationship between these two social concepts is quite different from what it appears to be at first sight.

The problem of peace found its first scientific interpretation in Marxist-Leninist philosophy. The nature and character of this social category can only be revealed by an approach in which the historical and the logical are organically combined. Like the concept of war, the concept of peace must be defined in terms of its political essence and class nature. In both cases politics have a decisive significance. This was pointed out by Clausewitz, who held that the outbreak of war did not mean the end of political relationships or their transformation into something entirely different, but was merely their continuation by different means.

Only the principle of the organic unity of the historical and the logical provides a basis for cognizance of the real, class essence of peace, and the main trends of its development, involving qualitative transformation of one kind of peace into another. The metaphysical approach leads to impoverishment of the content of peace, ignores the fact of its development and results in abstract theories of peace "in general".

Lenin criticised such views as follows. "The peace slogan can be advanced either in connection with definite peace terms, or without any conditions at all, as a struggle, not for a definite kind of peace, but for peace in general *(Frieden ohne weiters)*. In the latter case, we obviously have a slogan that is not only non-socialist but entirely devoid of meaning and content."[1]

In order to see the dialectic of the development of the concept of peace correctly it is necessary to adopt a concrete historical approach. The content of peace as a social category cannot be understood without concrete analysis of political relationships in a class society. The Marxist dialectic discovered these relationships by revealing the logic of the transition from particular methods of implementing class politics to others, from war to peace and vice versa.

Describing the nature of the relationship between war, peace

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 290.

and politics, Lenin wrote: "War is a continuation, by violent means, of the politics pursued by the ruling classes of the belligerent powers long before the outbreak of war. Peace is a continuation of the *very same* politics."[1]

There can be no non-class peace in a class society, any more than there can be non-class war or non-class politics. Politics is thus the point of departure for a concrete analysis of peace, just as it is in the case of war. If war is the continuation of politics by other, violent means, peace is the continuation of politics by non-violent means. Here lies the fundamental difference between war and peace. Lenin defined the historical content of the two concepts, war and peace, as follows: "Socialists have always condemned wars between nations as barbarous and brutal. Our attitude towards war, however, is fundamentally different from that of the bourgeois pacifists (supporters and advocates of peace) and of the anarchists. We differ from the former in that we understand the inevitable connection between wars and the class struggle within a country; we understand that wars cannot be abolished unless classes are abolished and socialism is created. . . ."[2]

Lenin criticises as devoid of meaning and content the metaphysical concept of war and peace as finite, eternal values—war an absolute evil and peace an absolute good.

Abstract interpretations of just peace were widespread before the appearance of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. It would be unfair to deny the positive value of such principles as, for example, those that underlay many utopian socialist concepts of just peace—the establishment of good neighbourly relations, equality and justice in international relations and so on. However, it was Marxist-Leninist philosophy that dealt the final death-blow to the unhistorical, abstract slogans of just peace in general.

Lenin criticised the dogmatic, abstract approach to peace. "To bourgeois pacifists and their 'socialist' imitators, or echoers, peace has always been a fundamentally distinct concept, for neither has ever understood that 'war is the continuation of policies of peace and peace the continuation of the policies of war'."[3]

The dialectic offered tremendous opportunities for penetrat-

---

[1] Ibid., Vol. 22, p. 163.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 21, p. 299.
[3] Ibid., Vol. 23, p. 192.

ing the social essence of peace. With the aid of the dialectic it was possible to determine that changes in the content of the concept of peace were directly dependent on the social nature of the policies of states and peoples. Thus, on the basis of dialectical analysis of political relations Marxism-Leninism produced a clear definition of the two opposite concepts of just peace and unjust peace. If political relations between states are based on enslavement and outright robbery, class and national oppression, the seizure of other people's territory and infringement of the independence of states, then the concept of peace that fully embodies all these essential features must be defined as an imperialist, unjust peace.

Time and again, in examining the essential features of imperialist peace, Lenin defined it as simply a "breathing space" between imperialist wars, as division of the imperialist spoils, or a typical example of the division and redivision of the world "on the basis of a new relation of forces", "being changed by methods *anything but* peaceful".[1] In the age of monopoly capitalism these breathing spaces between aggressive, predatory wars became shorter and shorter, with the result that the dividing line between imperialist war and imperialist peace became more and more blurred. Noting this qualitative feature in the dialectic of the transition from the concept of war to the concept of peace in the imperialist age, Lenin qualified the intense and uninterrupted struggle between the imperialist states as an example of "the division *and the redivision* of the world, the transition from peaceful division to non-peaceful division and vice versa".[2]

Lenin arrived at his definition of imperialist peace through analysis of the policies of the major capitalist states involved in the First World War. The imperialist nature of the war itself naturally led to an imperialist peace. Lenin insisted that the only way to determine the essence of the peace was to analyse the imperialist policies of the war. "And the truth of the present time, of the present war, of the present attempts to conclude peace, is the *division of the imperialist spoils.* That is at the bottom of it all; and to understand this truth, to express it, 'to show things as they actually are', is the fundamental task of socialist policy as distinct from bourgeois policy, the principal aim of which is to conceal, to gloss over this truth."[3]

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 274.
[2] Ibid., p. 273.
[3] Ibid., Vol. 23, p. 179.

This objective truth was revealed through historical analysis of the political essence of the First World War. Since the war was the continuation of the imperialist policies of the major capitalist powers, its outcome was an imperialist peace. An imperialist war naturally leads to an unjust imperialist peace. This was the scientific conclusion deduced from definition of the class essence of the First World War.

Lenin's answer to the non-dialectical views of various bourgeois philosophers and sociologists was as follows. "Neither the bourgeois nor the social-chauvinist wants to see that the imperialist war of 1914-1917 is the continuation of the imperialist policies of 1898-1914, if not of an even earlier period. Neither the bourgeois pacifists nor the socialist pacifists realise that without the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeois governments, peace *now* can only be an imperialist peace, a continuation of the imperialist war."[1]

A frequent major gnoseological error of bourgeois philosophers is that they attempt to determine the true essence of peace without reference to the class policies of states, and isolate the content of the concept of peace from the preceding policies of violence. Thus, Kautsky, Plekhanov and Trotsky had tried to examine the content of the concept of peace without any reference at all to the essence of the imperialist war or the policies of the bourgeois states in the age of imperialism.

Kautsky's theory, like the views of other opportunists and bourgeois pacifists, did not go beyond a feeble expression of subjective hopes of a just peace and abstract contrasting of war and peace. Some of them proposed that the war be brought to an end and a just peace be concluded by a one-sided withdrawal.

Lenin wrote: "The idea that the war can be terminated without changing the classes in power is an anarchist idea. Either this idea is anarchistic, in which case it has no meaning, or no state significance, or it is a hazy pacifist idea that fails completely to appreciate the connection between politics and the oppressing class."[2]

Lenin criticised such untenable abstract schemes for a just, democratic peace in the following terms: "The 'social' parsons and opportunists are always ready to build dreams of future peaceful socialism. But the very thing that distinguishes them from revolutionary Social-Democrats is that they refuse to

---

[1] Ibid., p. 192.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 24, p. 264.

think about and reflect on the fierce class struggle and class *wars* needed to achieve that beautiful future."[1] In the concrete historical conditions of the First World War, the only way to achieve a just, democratic peace was for the working masses to transform the imperialist war into a civil war against the bourgeois governments of all the belligerent countries. "Marxism is not pacifism," Lenin wrote. "Of course, the speediest possible termination of the war must be striven for. However, the 'peace' demand acquires a proletarian significance only if a *revolutionary* struggle is called for. Without a series of revolutions, what is called a democratic peace is a philistine Utopia."[2] Whoever wanted a democratic, enduring peace at that time should be in favour of a civil war against the imperialist governments and the monopoly bourgeoisie. This was the dialectic of the transition from a world imperialist war to a just, democratic international peace in the conditions then obtaining.

It is often the case in present conditions, too, that the only way for a people to ensure a just, democratic peace is to take up arms and engage in a just struggle against imperialism. Thus, the Egyptian and Algerian peoples achieved a just, democratic peace through a tenacious struggle against the colonialists and imperialist aggressors supported by the forces of internal reaction—the big bourgeoisie and landowners.

Revealing the historical and economic factors that bring about a war, the materialist dialectic at the same time examines the socio-political order whose establishment would ensure a just peace and remove the possibility of further wars occurring. Contemporary bourgeois metaphysicians attempt to prove that war is a permanent phenomenon in the life of society and peace is but a contingency, a chance occurrence. The materialist dialectic, revealing the class nature of war and demonstrating that war is the continuation of certain policies, has proved that socialism naturally eliminates war and engenders peace between the nations.

Whenever Lenin examined the problem of just peace, he always treated it in a definite historical context. If war as a social phenomenon is an intrinsic part of the development of social relations based on private ownership and is as much a natural feature of capitalist society as the exploitation of man

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 79.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 21, pp. 328-29.

by man, socialist society with its public ownership eliminates the conditions which engender war.

History itself has demonstrated that the basic content of the foreign policy of the world socialist system is the struggle for the creation of favourable conditions for the building of socialism and the strengthening of its own power, support for peoples struggling for national and social emancipation and for the consolidation of Lenin's principles of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems.

In the socialist countries there are no classes and social groups with a vested interest in war. Power is in the hands of the workers and peasants, who are firm supporters of peace between the working people of all countries.

Discussing the essence of the peaceful policy of socialism, Lenin insisted that the Communist Party on coming to power would see to it that the land of socialism based its relations with other countries on humanitarian principles of equality and non-intervention. "All our politics and propaganda, however," he wrote, "are directed towards putting an end to war and in no way towards driving nations to war."[1]

Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence between capitalist and socialist countries has been carried on and developed in the policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government. Today, powerful social and political forces dispose of formidable means to prevent the imperialists from launching a new world war.

* * *

The Marxist-Leninist analysis of the concepts of war and peace is of tremendous importance for the solution of present international problems. Marxism-Leninism elaborated a complete scientific dialectical-materialist theory of war and peace which provides the only valid basis for analysing the essence of any war, has revealed the relationship between politics and war in a class society, produced a scientific classification of different kinds of war and peace, and examined the historical conditions for the elimination of war and the establishment of enduring international peace. The consistent peaceful policy of the Soviet Union has dispelled the myth of a "Communist menace". The strengthening of the forces of socialism in Europe

[1] Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 470.

provides new opportunities for ensuring peaceful coexistence and co-operation between the peoples of that continent.

A most impressive example of such co-operation is provided by the good neighbourly relations that have been firmly established between the Soviet Union and Finland. Franco-Soviet relations represent a notable instance of two major powers with different social systems establishing ties of firm friendship and co-operation. Many developing countries also show a marked inclination to adopt an independent policy, based on their own national interests rather than those of any aggressive military blocs.

The power of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries provides a real counterbalance to the aggressive forces of imperialism, and represents an extremely important factor in preserving peace and preventing the outbreak of a third world war.

## Chapter IV

# POLITICS AND WAR IN OUR TIME

The problem of the relationship between politics and war, with its historical, economic, philosophical, sociological and military aspects, has attracted and continues to hold the attention not only of specialists in these various fields but also of millions of ordinary people all round the globe. Today mankind is deeply concerned as to whether war can be eliminated from the life of society and permanent peace established, or whether the terrible threat of war is destined to continue to hang over us, a threat to our future, and indeed, in present conditions, to the very existence of life on our planet.

Two ideologies—the Marxist-Leninist and the bourgeois—are locked in a fierce struggle over this question, and represent opposite world outlooks, methods of enquiry and class-political standpoints.

## Revolution in Views on Politics and War

Throughout the history of class society, which represents a comparatively short period in the history of mankind, innumerable wars, big and small, have occurred. It has been estimated that in the last 5,500 years mankind has gone through over 14,500 wars, an average of almost three a year! Some 4,000 million people lost their lives in them, more than the present population of the world. The most destructive of all

were the two world wars, with their colossal toll in human lives and in material values it had taken generations of labour to produce.

Every war in the past represented a method of solving certain social and international conflicts, an extreme means of overcoming antagonisms between classes, peoples and states. Times changed, one social order was superseded by another, and the forms and means of armed struggle were developed and improved, but war remained what it had always been—an instrument of politics. The ruling exploiter classes always resorted to war with the object of strengthening and extending their own power, in order to implement their policy of subjugating the working masses and in order to oppress and enslave other peoples. Lenin noted that it was the reactionary classes who were usually the first to resort to force, and "placed the bayonet on the agenda".[1]

At the same time, the progressive, revolutionary classes and peoples were, and still are compelled to resort to war as an extreme measure in their struggle against their oppressors. Lenin stressed that no revolutionary class can renounce revolutionary war.[2] But to the progressive forces in society war is abhorrent and they only resort to it with the object of defending themselves from the forces of counter-revolution. As Engels put it, "... when there is no reactionary force that must be overthrown, there can be no question of revolutionary force...".[3]

Many philosophers, sociologists and political and military figures of the past pointed out the close relationship that exists between war and politics. At the stage of slave-owning society, Plato and Aristotle regarded war as one of the means of achieving political objects, and the art of war as a part of the art of politics, "the art of statecraft".[4] Hegel considered the object of the policy of the state to be "the Universal Spirit", and held that the power of the state and its policy lay "in Reason". He demonstrated on the basis of numerous examples from history that "the armies were used for particular expeditions, suggested by policy".[5] The famous Russian general Kutuzov also emphasised the relationship between war and politics. In

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 346.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 25, p. 39.
[3] Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Band 38, S. 489-90.
[4] Aristotle, *Politics*, Saint-Petersburg, 1911, p. 22 (in Russian).
[5] Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*, New York, 1900, p. 308.

1811 he remarked that "political circumstances will indicate the kind of war".[1]

But, as we have already seen, it was the German military theorist Karl von Clausewitz (1780-1831) who gave the fullest picture of the relationship between war and politics prior to Marx. In his book *On War* he employed the Hegelian dialectic and generalised on the experience of the Napoleonic wars to establish the essential connection between war and politics. War, he wrote, is not an independent act, but depends on political relations, on politics. It always arises from the political situation and is invariably caused by political motives. It represents the continuation of politics by other means, and is in fact an instrument of politics. War is politics substituting "the sword for the pen". Since war is a part of politics, it naturally assumes the features and character of politics and should be measured by the political yardstick. "When politics become more mighty and puissant then so does war."[2]

War is an act of violence. In war everything is subordinated to the law of settlement by military force. The scale on which force is employed and the intensity of the armed conflict depend on the political aim pursued. The political aim is the measure of both the end being pursued by means of military action and the necessary military efforts. It is thus "senseless to subordinate the political standpoint to the military".[3]

These propositions represented the high water mark of bourgeois thought on the problem of war. They were duly praised by the classics of Marxism-Leninism. Engels referred to Clausewitz as a "star of the first magnitude" in German military literature, and Lenin called him one of the very great writers on questions of military history.

Clausewitz employed Hegel's idealist dialectic to reveal the relationship between war and politics and it left its mark on his views too. Clausewitz treated politics from the idealist standpoint, without reference to economic factors, the class struggle, or the character of the social order. He thus regarded politics as the "Reason of the state personified",[4] and "representative of the interests of the whole of society".[5] Moreover, by

---

[1] M. Kutuzov, *Documents*, Voyenizdat, 1952, Vol. III, p. 754 (in Russian).

[2] Karl von Clausewitz, op. cit., p. 729.

[3] Ibid., p. 730.

[4] Ibid., p. 35.

[5] Ibid., p. 730.

politics he intended only foreign policy, and completely ignored the home policy of the ruling class. Since he did not understand the class nature of politics and their material roots, Clausewitz failed to perceive the true essence of war, its content and character, the economic and socio-political class factors that underlie it. He held that all wars were historically necessary and lawful. In short, his views were circumscribed within the narrow framework of the bourgeois idealist outlook of his age.

Some modern bourgeois ideologists studying the problem of war and peace lavish excessive praise on Clausewitz, crediting him with more than he really deserves. Thus, the French sociologist and historian C. Rougeron writes in his preface to a French edition of Clausewitz's *On War* that he was "the greatest military classic of all times".[1] The West German military historian W. R. Schramm describes him as "the only military philosopher of lasting importance that Europe has produced".[2]

Such exaggeration of the role of Clausewitz is not only a distortion of historical truth, but an instrument used to belittle the Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the relationship between war and politics. Thus, we find in *Wehrwissenschaftliche Rundschau,* a military journal of the West German revanchists: "We too must interpret Clausewitz's theory creatively and develop it as an instrument of the world-wide political and philosophical dispute, if we wish to cross spiritual swords with the East and overcome it ideologically, as we need to."[3]

In accordance with this and similar aims, philosophers, sociologists and military historians in the capitalist countries often go out of their way to make it appear that there is nothing new in the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of war and that it has been borrowed wholesale from Clausewitz, a bourgeois military theorist. Typical in this respect are the views expressed by R. L. Garthoff, an American specialist in falsification of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of war and politics. He maintains that the Soviet outlook fully accepts Clausewitz's idea that war is the continuation of politics by other means, without any critical re-evaluation or modification of its content or meaning.[4] Similar views are to be found in the collective work *Protracted*

---

[1] Karl von Clausewitz, *De la guerre*, Paris, 1955, p. 9.

[2] *Wehrkunde,* Jan. 1966, Band I, S. 2.

[3] *Wehrwissenschaftliche Rundschau,* Nov. 1958, Band II, p. 655.

[4] See R. L. Garthoff, *Soviet Military Doctrine*, Glencoe, 1953, p. 10, and *Soviet Strategy in the Nuclear Age*, New York, 1958, p. 6.

*Conflict*: "The idea that military and political instruments are interchangeable in the execution of one vast strategic plan, central to Clausewitz's thought, is the pith of Communist doctrine."[1]

The West German sociologist T. Arnold writes in his *The Revolutionary War* that Lenin merely restated Clausewitz's "proposition that 'war is the continuation of politics by other means', called it 'dialectical', and added that war is not only a political phenomenon but a climax, an 'ultima ratio of politics' ". He goes on to say: "This estimate of war as a special case of politics is taken over by the Communists as the basis of their interpretation of conflicts in full accordance with the 'dialectical method'. ... This thesis derived from the doctrine of Clausewitz underlies the whole of Communist military and political strategy."[2] Similar statements occur in the writings of important NATO figures, for instance in Admiral Ruge's book *Politics, the Military, Alliance*, where we are told that Clausewitz created the theory of war and Lenin "adopted and successfully applied his idea".[3] In this manner the ideologists of imperialism try to belittle the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of war and politics and discredit it in the eyes of the masses.

In fact, however, Marxism-Leninism brought about a complete revolution in views of war and politics, providing the first scientific interpretation of them, banishing idealism, metaphysics and sophistry. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine of war and politics naturally did not appear out of the blue, and it absorbed all that was best and progressive in earlier military theory. Nevertheless it is by no means a restatement of Clausewitz's views but represents a qualitatively new, higher stage, a highly original system of views.

The fact that Marxism-Leninism accepts the words of the formula that war is the continuation of politics by violent means should not be allowed to mask the totally different content with which materialists and idealists imbue it. The Marxist-Leninist theory of war and politics is based on the principles of dialectical materialism, on elucidation of the material, economic factors that underlie and determine politics, and on analysis of their class nature. Military theorists of the

---

[1] R. Strausz-Hupé, W. R. Kintner, J. E. Dougherty and A. J. Cottrell, *Protracted Conflict*, New York, 1959, p. 31.

[2] Theodor Arnold, *Der revolutionäre Krieg*, 3. Aufl., Pfaffenhofen-Ilm, 1961, S. 19-20.

[3] Friedrich Ruge, *Politik, Militär, Bündnis*, Stuttgart, 1963, S. 51.

NATO countries prefer to ignore this aspect, thereby revealing their biased, hostile attitude to Marxist-Leninist ideology.

War is a part of the whole, a part of politics. The dialectic of the part and the whole, of war and politics, is of a contradictory nature. Thus, Lenin wrote: "With reference to wars, the main thesis of dialectics, which has been so shamelessly distorted by Plekhanov to please the bourgeoisie, is that '*war is simply the continuation of politics by other* [i.e., violent] *means*'.

"And it was always the standpoint of Marx and Engels, who regarded *any* war as the continuation of the politics of the powers concerned—and the *various classes* within these countries—in a definite period."[1]

Politics occupy the dominant position in relation to war. The content of a war, its essence, character and causes cannot be understood without reference to the politics of the respective classes and states, without studying the whole system of political relations that developed some time before the war, brought the war about and continued during it. Lenin was scornful of those who held that with the outbreak of war the historically prepared political relations between classes and nations were interrupted. He considered it gross ignorance, a philistine prejudice to imagine that war could be viewed separately from the politics of the respective governments and classes, simply as an enemy attack. "...The most important thing that is usually overlooked in the question of the war, a key issue to which insufficient attention is paid and over which there is so much dispute—useless, hopeless, idle dispute, I should say—is the question of the class character of the war: what caused that war, what classes are waging it, and what historical and historico-economic conditions gave rise to it."[2] Lenin maintained that in order to judge a war and determine what attitude to take to it, it was necessary to investigate the historical circumstances from which it arose, what political system it was connected with, what politics had given rise to it, and what classes were waging it and with what aims. The ruling class determines politics in war as well as in peace.

Lenin insisted that each war must be approached from a concrete historical viewpoint, that in order to understand the character of a particular war one must first have an under-

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 219.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 24, p. 398.

standing of the character of the particular age. Lenin was not satisfied to define war in general terms but made a thorough analysis of the nature and specific features of wars in the age of monopoly capitalism. He divided these into different types, expounded a doctrine of two kinds of wars—just and unjust—and explained the nature of wars in defence of the socialist state.

Marxism-Leninism rejects the idealist concept of politics in investigating the essence, character and content of war, and its dependence on politics. Lenin described politics as the concentrated expression of economics, their generalisation and consequence. The material roots of policies giving rise to war were to be sought in the exploiting method of production based on private ownership. At the same time, Lenin warned against oversimplifying the relationship between economics and politics, the automatic deduction of politics from economics, and pointed out the relatively independent nature of politics and the fact that they, in turn, influence economics.

Politics comprise the relations between classes and peoples within a state (home policy), and also the relations between states and nations (foreign policy). The two are closely interrelated, the former playing the dominant role and determining the content and character of the latter. Lenin stressed that "no idea could be more erroneous or harmful than to separate foreign from home policy".[1] This thesis should not be taken as suggesting that foreign policy can be reduced simply to a function of home policy. Indeed, at times foreign policy can exert a decisive influence on home policy. Nevertheless the major role goes to home policy. War is the result not of home or foreign policy taken separately, but of the two together, the two interrelated sides combined.

Politics embody the relations between large masses of people and reflect their conflicting interests and aspirations. The essence of politics is the winning, holding and wielding of power. As Lenin put it, serious politics begin where it is a question of the destiny of millions. Thus, politics can actually be said to be the destiny of millions. Modern wars are prepared and launched by the politics of imperialism, but these wars draw into their orbit vast masses of people, and set whole nations in motion. Thus, the character of the politics that lead to and are con-

[1] Ibid., Vol. 25, p. 85.

tinued in a war has a decisive influence on the way the masses behave in the war, on its course and outcome.

Politics as a form of human relations and a specific human activity have an objective and a subjective side. The objective, decisive side is the sphere of class relations, and the relations between nations and states which, in the final analysis, are not dependent on people's conscious will. Politics, Lenin wrote, "have their own objective logic, irrespective of what persons or parties plan in advance".[1] The subjective side of politics derives from the objective, which it expresses and reflects. It involves the orientation of the activity of classes, parties, statesmen, politicians, military leaders, and the like, political theories and programmes, slogans, etc.

The policy of the exploiter classes not only prepares a particular war, determining its political content, aim and character, but also influences the strategy and tactics employed, the methods and form of the armed conflict, the organisational structure of the armed forces, the methods of military leadership and training. Politics underlie military strategy and warfare in general. The introduction of nuclear weapons leads to increased "politicisation" of strategy: the dependence of strategy on politics becomes greater and the relationship between them becomes more complex. Conversely, politics take into account the achievements and needs of military strategy, so that the latter has an active influence on politics.[2]

However, war is not ordinary politics, but politics carried out in a special way, by means of armed force. On the outbreak of war, armed violence, military action, becomes the main instrument of policy, the form in which it is pursued, since, as Lenin put it, "military resistance cannot be broken except by military means. . .".[3] Armed struggle is subject to special objective laws, studied by military science. For the purpose of waging an armed struggle a special organisation is created—the armed forces which are provided with specific equipment (arms and materiel)—that differs qualitatively from the instruments of peaceful labour. Special organs—Ministries of Defence, General Staffs, and so on—are created and special methods employed to conduct the armed struggle, and direct military actions. Armed struggle, the fundamental attribute of

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 379.

[2] This is treated in detail in *Voyennaya Strategiya*, Moscow, 1963, pp. 28-36.

[3] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 247.

war, influences politics and every other aspect of life in the belligerent states.

Armed struggle puts a special qualitative stamp on the war, making it, in Lenin's words, "barbarous and brutal",[1] the extreme method of resolving political disputes, a strict judge and arbiter of relations between classes, nations and states. It would be wrong to reduce war to the specific means and methods employed, to the armed struggle alone, isolated from class and state politics.

Thus, Marxism-Leninism established the profound relationship between war and politics, showed for the first time the class nature of politics and its continuation, war; revealed the causes of war, its connection with the socio-political system of exploitation based on private property, and discovered the historically transient nature of war, and the specific objective nature of the laws of armed struggle. All this serves to refute the erroneous view of the ideologists of imperialism who deny that there is any qualitative difference between the theories of Clausewitz and Marxist-Leninist doctrine of politics and war.

## Has War Ceased to Be the Continuation of Politics?

The profound relationship between war and politics expounded scientifically by the founders of Marxism-Leninism is not a static, permanent relationship. Like all other relationships in nature and society it develops and changes, growing more complicated. Certain changes take place in the relationship between war and politics and in their very essence which must be taken note of in theory and practical activity.

As a result of the changes taking place in the process of socio-economic development, politics undergo certain fundamental changes and acquire a qualitatively new content at different stages. These changes in politics affect the essence, content and character of war, and provide a basis for drawing distinctions between wars in different ages, an objective basis for their scientific classification according to type and their class character, for their qualification as just or unjust, and for

[1] Ibid., Vol. 21, p. 299.

evolving the strategy and tactics of Marxist-Leninist parties.

Simultaneously with changes in politics and under their influence, the means, methods and forms of armed struggle have been improved, and the scale of wars, as regards the area, the complex arms and equipment and the number of people involved, has increased. Wars assume an ever more destructive character, the social consequences become ever greater, as does the reverse influence of war on politics and all other aspects of the life of the belligerent peoples and states. This is another way in which fundamental changes in the essence, content and character of war are manifested.

Today, changes in the relationship between war and politics are brought about by three factors. Firstly, they are brought about by the change in the relationship of forces between the two opposed camps, by the world socialist system becoming the decisive factor in the development of mankind and by the increasingly aggressive nature of imperialism on the retreat. Secondly, they are the result of the more involved nature of political relations in our age, an age characterised by the struggle between two opposed social systems, socialist revolutions and national liberation struggles, the collapse of imperialism, the liquidation of colonialism, new nations choosing the socialist path of development, the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-wide scale and the political awakening of millions of people in every corner of the globe. Moreover, it is in this age of ours that politics have received a powerful material base in connection with the scientific and technological revolution and the rapid development of the productive forces. The third factor that has fundamentally altered the relationship between war and politics is the revolution in warfare that has taken place on the basis of advances in production, science and technology.

The revolution in warfare has manifested itself first and foremost in the unprecedented development of armaments and military equipment, in the change-over from conventional to nuclear and thermonuclear weapons and delivery vehicles, and also chemical and bacteriological weapons, and the wide introduction of automation and cybernetics. The introduction of nuclear missiles on a vast scale in the last few years makes warfare an incomparably more dangerous proposition than any previous war waged with conventional weapons.

Nuclear weapons, combined with the latest delivery vehicles, make vulnerable every point on the globe. Highly accurate,

they can destroy their target in an extremely short space of time, quite irrespective of weather conditions, the time of the year or the time of day. Attacks can be launched from small launching sites on or under ground, mobile platforms, submarines, surface vessels or aircraft. They make for extremely high firing manoeuvrability and a high state of action alertness. All this makes defence against nuclear missiles extremely difficult.

Nuclear missiles have completely transformed the material and technical base of the armed forces, have led to fundamental changes in their structure and organisation, in the roles and relative importance of the various arms, and in their training methods.

With respect to an earlier age, Marx wrote: "With the invention of a new instrument of warfare, firearms, the whole internal organisation of the army necessarily changed; the relationships within which individuals can constitute an army and act as an army were transformed and the relations of different armies to one another also changed."[1] In the same way, only more so, this process can be seen to have taken place in connection with the creation of nuclear weapons.

New military doctrines and new concepts of strategy have been developed on the basis of the latest weapons and military equipment. Qualitatively new methods and forms of armed struggle have arisen. Unlike conventional weapons, designed for striking armed forces engaged on the battlefield, the new weapons are primarily directed against major economic and political centres, against large cities and the civilian population. The first samples of these weapons, which are already out of date, were used by the American imperialists not to strike military targets but against the civilian population of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The fact that the NATO leadership has adopted nuclear missiles for the furtherance of its aggressive policy has caused its ideologists to step up their activities in military theory, falsify the problem of war and peace and engage in open and covert apologetics of the use of military force.

Some imperialist ideologists, while holding as valid Clausewitz's formula that war is the continuation of politics by forceful means, refuse to take into account new features of the relationship between war and politics, arguing in favour of the

---

[1] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1969, Vol. 1, p. 152.

policy of nuclear blackmail and the arms race in nuclear and conventional weapons, and shutting their eyes to the danger of a world war.

In his books *On Thermonuclear War, Thinking About the Unthinkable* and *On Escalation,* H. Kahn, who has been called "the Clausewitz of the nuclear age", expounds his doctrine of the "admissibility" of nuclear war as an instrument of the aggressive policy of American imperialism. He has developed a theory of escalation, conceived as an escalator rising in 44 stages, across the nuclear threshold to the cherished dream of the nuclear warmongers—an all-out thermonuclear war. Kahn's gloomy, inhuman writings have, he is proud to admit, become indispensable textbooks on military planning for the Pentagon.

At the same time the ideologists of imperialism try to discredit the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the relationship between war and politics, by propagating the idea that the new weapons have fundamentally altered this relationship as it stood for centuries.

In his *Soviet Strategy at the Crossroads* the American anti-communist T. W. Wolfe speaks of "erosion" of classical Marxist-Leninist doctrine, and Lenin's views on war as an instrument of politics. "A nuclear environment," he writes, "...has helped to undermine traditional Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the link between war and politics, and has given rise to disturbing questions on the political utility of the use of military power, or the threat of its use in the nuclear-missile age."[1] One is left in no doubt at all as to the class bias of such thinking, the object of which is not to get at the truth but simply to discredit Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

In point of fact, however, the profound relationship between war and politics presented in the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism loses none of its validity in the nuclear age, but merely assumes a more complex and contradictory form. Plainly nuclear war cannot appear out of the blue, out of a void. It can only be the result of intention, of the malevolent policies of aggressive imperialist groups. Like the two world wars, which were the outcome and continuation of the depredatory, aggressive policies of the imperialist powers, and like countless local wars waged by imperialism since the defeat of

---

[1] Thomas W. Wolfe, *Soviet Strategy at the Crossroads,* Cambridge, 1964, p. 4.

Nazi Germany and militarist Japan, a thermonuclear world war could only be the outcome and continuation of the aggressive policy of American imperialism and its accomplices, its monstrous instrument.

The tremendous danger involved in nuclear war has naturally influenced the way bourgeois theorists, politicians and strategists view it, producing a dual and contradictory attitude. While regarding nuclear weapons as a powerful instrument for opposing socialism and communism, they at the same time fear the fatal consequences a nuclear war would have for capitalism. Hence the policy of staking on limited, local wars.

Some imperialist ideologists, fully aware of the dangers of a nuclear war, while not rejecting it in principle, would like the use of nuclear weapons in the interests of politics to be limited and localised. They want nuclear war on a limited scale, to have it limited to certain spheres that suit their purposes, to make it easier to handle and less dangerous as a means of achieving their aggressive political objects. This kind of thinking has found expression in the theory of local wars and in the creation of nuclear weapons with a limited capacity for use in such wars. Professor W. Kaufmann, specialist in international relations, believes that limited wars "preserve us from revolutionary and disorienting changes that are the products of great wars".[1]

According to these bourgeois ideologists the policy of limited warfare should apply to all aspects of war. Thus, political aims, the nuclear weapons employed, geographical area, strike targets and duration of military actions, should all be limited. They distinguish several different kinds of limited wars: wars between small countries where the interests of the major powers are not affected, wars between major Western capitalist countries or small countries in which other countries are not involved, wars between a major power and small countries, and lastly, limited wars between major powers, not allowed to develop into a world nuclear conflict.[2]

Bourgeois ideologists only view the essence and character of limited wars in quantitative terms: limited use of forces and arms, limited area of operations, limited political and strategic aims fixed in advance, and so on. Such an approach completely

[1] "Limited Warfare", by William W. Kaufmann, *Military Policy and National Security*, Ed. by W. W. Kaufmann, New Jersey, 1956.

[2] Henry A. Kissinger, *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy*, New York, 1957, pp. 136-41.

obscures the class nature of such wars and their political content, and allows for no distinction between just and unjust wars.

The Marxist-Leninist method of inquiry rejects this bourgeois objectivist approach, analysing these wars in terms of class, political and other socio-economic factors underlying them. Limited wars are but another form of the continuation of aggressive imperialist policy by violent means: the fact that they involve limited forces and means employed in a limited area does not affect their class nature, embodying aggressive politics combined with armed force applied in strictly controlled doses.

The Marxist-Leninist classification of limited wars, on the other hand, is based not so much on quantitative factors as on qualitative features—the class essence, political content, social character, socio-historical role, and methods of armed struggle. Only a classification of this sort, based on quantitative and qualitative features combined, makes it possible to determine the attitude of the masses, classes and parties to this kind of war.

Limited wars are directed primarily against the socialist countries and peoples struggling for social and national emancipation. By waging limited wars, the American imperialists and their stooges strive to stave off the final break-up of the colonial system and impose neo-colonialism on the newly-independent countries. The brutal aggression of the American imperialists in Indochina and the Israeli aggression against the Arab countries provide a clear demonstration of this.

The supporters of limited wars advocate limited use of nuclear weapons. Far from declaring themselves in favour of having nuclear weapons banned, they are opposed to the solution of international disputes by peaceful means and the cessation of the arms race. Thus, the American military theoretician R. Osgood, for example, declares in his book *Limited War*: "It is a peculiarly irresponsible form of self-righteousness to regard general renunciation of force as more virtuous than the planned disposition of military power as a rational instrument of policy."[1]

History has shown that limited wars serve as the prelude to world wars and hasten their occurrence. In our time the danger of this happening is greater than ever before. Not that every local conflict will inevitably develop into a world conflict; but

[1] Robert E. Osgood, *Limited War. The Challenge to American Strategy*. Chicago, 1957, p. 283.

given the tense and complex international situation, the complex system of mutual treaty obligations among the states of the different camps and the rapid advances in nuclear technology, there is always the danger that it will, especially where nuclear weapons are employed.

Thus, a considerable number of imperialist ideologists advocate the use of means of mass destruction on a local or global scale for the achievement of political objectives. Their views and theories are embodied in the strategic conceptions of American imperialism and its partners.

One of these conceptions is the strategy of "flexible response", developed as a result of criticism of the strategy of "massive retaliation", i.e., the immediate mass use of nuclear weapons against major targets in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The strategy of "massive retaliation" was based on the absolutisation of nuclear weapons, underestimation of conventional weapons, and on the acceptance of nuclear war as the only valid alternative.

Thus M. Taylor writes in *The Uncertain Trumpet*: "Massive retaliation could offer our leaders only two choices, the initiation of general war or compromise and retreat."[1]

In place of the strategy of "massive retaliation", Taylor suggested a strategy of "flexible response", as being "flexible enough for ready adaptation to presently unforeseen and unforeseeable situations."[2] In other words, the aggressive strategy of "flexible response" is oriented not only towards world nuclear war, but also towards the waging of limited wars using both nuclear and conventional weapons on behalf of the aggressive policy of American imperialism.

An important element of the strategy of "flexible response" is the "forward strategy" of the Bonn revanchists, which intends that the armed forces of the aggressive NATO bloc should be moved as close as possible to the frontiers of the socialist countries so that in the case of a war operations could immediately be carried into their territory, with the emphasis on NATO nuclear forces.

A third group of bourgeois ideologists, aware that a nuclear war would be fatal to capitalism, declares the old conception, i.e., Clausewitz's formula that war is the continuation of politics by violent means, to be no longer valid in view of the

---

[1] M. D. Taylor, *The Uncertain Trumpet*, New York, 1960, p. 5.
[2] Ibid., p. 36.

fact that nuclear weapons have fundamentally altered the traditional relationship between war and politics.

Senator John Fulbright declared in one of his speeches that Clausewitz's theory that war is the same policy but carried out by other methods is no longer valid, that the appearance of nuclear weapons has rendered it obsolete. This view is also to be found in the book *Global Strategy* by RAF Vice-Marshal Kingston-McCloughry, who writes: "Take his (Clausewitz's) most famous pronouncement that 'war is the continuation of policy by other means', viz., by force, and consider it in the light of present-day conditions. Nothing would seem further from the truth in the event of nuclear war."[1] This opinion is expressed by French sociologist and historian C. Delmas in his *Nuclear Strategy*,[2] and is to be found in numerous books, articles and speeches of other military writers in the capitalist West.

The main argument used to prove that Clausewitz's formula is no longer valid is that modern warfare represents a danger to the economy of both sides. The argument of growing economic vulnerability is used by West German sociologist and economist F. Sternberg in his *The Military and Industrial Revolution*.[3]

There is no denying the fact that a nuclear-missile war represents a tremendous threat to the economy of the countries involved. But Sternberg's conclusion cannot be automatically deduced from this and is untenable, since he does not take into account the essence, the political content and class character of a possible future war, or its connection with the aggressive policy of monopoly capital.

Other arguments against the validity of Clausewitz's formula are based on the theory that modern war has gone beyond the confines of politics and produced a "thermonuclear paradox", whereby the threat of a nuclear disaster has become a means of preventing a military conflict between the two systems, making the threat of nuclear war a new stabilising factor, a new guarantee of peace. Thus, a new socio-political function, that of preserving peace, is attributed to war and the fear of it in the nuclear age. L. Bohn of the American Rand Corporation writes in his article "Peace with Disarmament—or

---

[1] E. J. Kingston-McCloughry, *Global Strategy*, New York, 1957, p. 248.
[2] Claude Delmas. *La stratégie nucléaire*, Paris, 1963, pp. 17-18.
[3] F. Sternberg, *Die militärische und industrielle Revolution*, Berlin, 1957, S. 62.

Without?" that "the fundamental instrument for preventing war" is war, and that the destruction of nuclear stockpiles would only serve to greatly increase the danger of a new world war, making it practically inevitable.[1]

Bourgeois ideologists also declare that modern military technique has destroyed the sense of war and deprived it of its political content, freeing arms from politics. Thus, T. K. Finletter writes: "Applied science for destruction is wholly out of hand: it is like a wild tiger running about the city streets."[2] A similar point of view is to be found in the collection of articles published in West Germany. It stresses that the totalitarian tendency in the development of technology has led to a situation where "military weapons run free like the magic broom in the fairy tale", have run out of the door of politics, out of their control. War thus ceases to be the continuation of politics and becomes a ruinous struggle for "naked survival". Henceforth the type of weapon determines the concept of war. "If wars in the past were the continuation of politics by other means, modern politics are but the continuation of war, which could enter the hot stage at any moment".[3]

There is, of course, a certain amount of truth in assertions of this sort made by Western sociologists and military writers with various philosophical views and political credos—their unanimous recognition of the exceptional danger of nuclear war used as an instrument of the aggressive policy of imperialism. At the same time, it is necessary to expose these arguments as being highly fallacious, one-sided, and showing a strong class bias.

Firstly, in rejecting Clausewitz's formula these bourgeois sociologists and military writers are in fact attacking the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of war and politics and trying to prove that it is no longer valid in the nuclear age. This is a new method of attacking the Marxist-Leninist theories in a covert manner, often behind a pacifist mask.

Secondly, these arguments represent an attempt to mask the role of the aggressive policy of American imperialism in the creation of the new weapons of mass destruction. Nuclear weap-

---

[1] *Disarmament: Its Politics and Economics*, Ed. by Seymour Melman, Boston, 1962, p. 50.

[2] Thomas K. Finletter, *Power and Policy. US Foreign Policy and Military Power in the Hydrogen Age*, New York, 1952, p. 392.

[3] *Atomkrieg*, Bad Godesberg, 1955, S. 35, 36, 40.

ons are not simply a product of the development of science and technology, they are above all the monstrous offspring of the militarist policies of monopoly capitalism striving for world domination. Nuclear weapons are the material embodiment of aggressive power politics. Scientific and technological progress made possible the invention of nuclear weapons, but the decisive role in turning this possibility into a reality was played by imperialist politics. It was the aggressive, anti-Soviet and anti-socialist policy of American imperialism and its one-sided, selfish use of the achievements of scientific and technological progress that actually produced weapons of mass destruction, led to the nuclear arms race, determined the direction of changes in the structure of the US armed forces and the armed forces of the North Atlantic bloc and their equipment with nuclear weapons, and determined the NATO strategy based on the massive use of nuclear weapons against the socialist countries.

It is significant that bourgeois writers closely connected with militarist circles themselves admit the supreme importance of politics in the creation of nuclear weapons.

Militarist circles actually admit the relationship between politics and war, accept Clausewitz's formula, and are guided by it in their practical military and political activities. They reject neither aggressive politics and war as a means of achieving political ends nor the production and use of nuclear weapons. On the contrary, these terrible weapons (along with conventional arms) are the basis of the aggressive policy and strategy of American imperialism and its partners in NATO and other blocs, directed above all against the socialist countries. Thus, the NATO journal *General Military Review*, mouthpiece of the most aggressive imperialist groups and their nuclear policies and strategy, declares that the most extreme measures, up to and including a world war, however terrible it may be, should be employed in the struggle against communism.

The third feature of the above-mentioned arguments used by bourgeois sociologists and military writers which renders them untenable is the fact that they fail to separate two related but quite distinct questions, lumping them together as one. These are the question of the essence, political content and class character of nuclear war which belongs to the realm of military theory, and the question of whether nuclear war should be allowed to serve as a political instrument, which

belongs to the realm of practical politics. By combining these two essentially different aspects of the problem, sociologists, politicians and military groups of the capitalist countries demonstrate a narrow class outlook, a singular philosophical, methodological bias, and a failure to comprehend the complex relationship between politics and war.

Bourgeois sociologists and military writers deliberately or unwittingly separate war from the aggressive policies of imperialism, although the two are quite inseparable, and try to present a possible future war as a natural disaster, in the form of a technological conflict of machines, having nothing to do with the aggressive policy of imperialism or with any political aims at all. Thus, in his *Policy in the Shadow of the Bomb*, West German sociologist R. Mattfeldt writes of war using the latest weapons as a natural catastrophe like eruptive protuberances on the sun, volcanic eruptions and so on. "Nuclear explosions," he writes, "are catastrophes unleashed by pressing a button."[1] He does not regard nuclear war as a struggle between people.

Thus the masses are misled as to the real essence, political content and class character of a possible future war, are morally and politically disarmed and confused over what course to take and how to act. They are made to believe that in the event of a world war the armed forces and inhabitants of the NATO countries would be fighting not for the political interests and aspirations of monopoly capital, but for their own lives, simply to save themselves from physical annihilation. The aim is to clear the aggressors of all responsibility for preparing and launching a nuclear catastrophe.

Thus, over the question of the essence of politics and war Marxists-Leninists are waging a struggle on two fronts. They struggle against the dogmatic approach, against relativism and revisionism in any form, against attempts to absolutise theories and formulae advanced in the past and sanctioned by habit, and their transformation into self-contained abstractions quite unrelated to real conditions which are changing all the time. At the same time, they oppose attempts to cast doubt on the doctrine of the relationship between politics and war which laid the foundations for scientific inquiry into the subject, and which has lost none of its validity today.

---

[1] Rudolf Mattfeldt, *Politik im Schatten der Bombe*, Münich-Wien, 1963, S. 13.

## Thermonuclear War: the Greatest Crime Against Humanity

Marxists-Leninists, on the basis of the dialectical materialist method of inquiry, consider thermonuclear war to be a special kind of warfare in its essence, content, character, the means of armed struggle employed, and its possible consequences.

A thermonuclear war launched by imperialism would be qualitatively different from wars in the past or modern wars using conventional weapons above all in its concrete political content, its political aims and its class character. It would resolve not individual, limited political issues, but an issue of historic importance, affecting the fate of all mankind.

Another fundamental difference between thermonuclear war and conventional warfare is the means employed for the achievement of political objects. Whereas in conventional warfare the political aim is achieved through destruction of the enemy's armed forces, in a nuclear war its achievement would involve the destruction of the opponent's armed forces and nuclear capacity by means of economic annihilation.

A nuclear war would also differ from previous wars in the methods and form of armed struggle employed. It would most certainly involve the use of nuclear missiles and would draw into its destructive orbit many countries and nations, thus becoming a world conflict.

Unlike conventional warfare, nuclear war represents a threat of the first magnitude as regards its social, biological, psychological, moral and other consequences. As stressed in the Main Document of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties (Moscow, 1969), a nuclear war would result in the death of millions of people and the devastation of whole countries and this is why struggle against the danger of war, the danger of a world nuclear war remains a basic element of the united actions of the anti-imperialist forces.

A nuclear war, should it occur, would be basically serving the insane, criminal policy of imperialism aimed at the destruction of the socialist countries and the recapture of the lost positions of capitalism.

In contrast to the imperialist countries, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries oppose nuclear war and are working towards the banning of nuclear weapons. However, if the imperialists should force the socialist camp into a war, such a

war would be the continuation of the latter's just, defensive, liberation policy, a just and lawful act of countering aggression, the natural right and sacred duty of progressive mankind to destroy their bitterest enemy and the source of destructive wars—imperialism.

A world war is not fatally inevitable: it can be prevented from happening. In the world today there exist powerful socio-political forces capable of preventing the outbreak of a thermonuclear war, of isolating militarist circles and frustrating their aggressive policy. These forces are the world socialist system, the world communist, working-class and national liberation movements, and millions of individuals all over the world strongly opposing war in the peace movement. They dispose of the material and moral means and resources for isolating the warmongers and averting a nuclear conflict.

The scientists and intellectuals of all countries have an important role to play in the struggle to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. They bear a tremendous moral and social responsibility for the destiny of mankind.

The scientists who created nuclear weapons, and the best representatives of other professions are well aware of the gigantic destructive capacity of these weapons. It is therefore their duty to bring to bear the whole weight of their authority in opposition to the warmongers.

While being strongly opposed to nuclear war, the Marxists-Leninists do not oppose all kinds of war. They support just, revolutionary wars, in which the masses take up arms to fight for their freedom and independence and for socialism—such as the wars of national liberation resulting from contradictions between the imperialist powers and the peoples of colonial and dependent countries, and civil wars provoked by antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. These are wholly just, emancipatory wars, the continuation and instrument of the revolutionary policies of national, social and class emancipation.

The Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union states that the CPSU and the whole Soviet people will continue to oppose all kinds of annexationist wars, including those between capitalist countries, and also local wars whose object is to crush national liberation movements, and that they consider it their duty to support the sacred struggle of oppressed peoples, their just wars of liberation against imperialism.

In this the Marxists-Leninists differ fundamentally from the pacifists, who are opposed to all wars including just and lawful ones. The pacifists are out to find "models" for eternal peace. Professor Galtung, Director of the Oslo International Institute of Peace Studies, has counted thirty-five such model projects—peace based on "nuclear deterrence", the creation of a world state, man's development towards spiritual and moral perfection, the religious path to peace and so on. To this motley collection of pacifist peace plans, Galtung added his own, which he calls the theory of enthropy. The essence of this theory is that as political, economic, technological, cultural, scientific and other ties and relations grow more complicated, the sharp contrasts between the two separate social systems will gradually become softened and blurred, leading eventually to universal peace.[1]

Pacifist ideology is unscientific. It fails to reveal the true sources of war, their class essence, and misleads the masses as to how universal peace can be achieved, disorienting people and disarming them in the face of the threat of war presented by imperialism. Marxists-Leninists reject pacifism and support those who are striving for peace by opposing imperialist wars.

The Soviet Union's relations with the countries of the capitalist world are based on Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence between states irrespective of their social system. This principle means that international disputes should be resolved by peaceful means, without resorting to armed force. Soon after the First World War, Lenin pointed out that the prevention of a new, even more destructive world war had become "the keystone of all policy in all the countries of the globe".[2]

Today, the question of preventing a thermonuclear war has assumed even greater importance and has become the pivot of world politics. The need to uphold the principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, resolutely oppose the aggressive forces of imperialism and save mankind from a new world war was expressed by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at its 24th Congress. The creation of a reliable system of collective security in Europe and other parts of the world would represent a tremendous contribution to the cause of peace.

In its manifold activities towards the building of communism

---

[1] A. Buchholz, *Die grosse Transformation*, Stuttgart, 1968, S. 112.
[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 55.

and strengthening the defence capacity of the Soviet Union, the CPSU is guided by the great ideas of Lenin and is constantly working to put them into practice, safeguarding the Leninist heritage and resolutely opposing all attempts to distort it. The Leninist policy of the CPSU and the fraternal parties is a major factor of peace and social progress, and creates favourable conditions for the building of socialism and communism and the development of the revolutionary and liberation movement.

This policy is imbued with the spirit of internationalism and a strong sense of responsibility for the destiny of mankind, the success of the communist movement in its struggle against imperialism, the co-operation of all Communist and Workers' Parties and the unity of all anti-imperialist forces. The Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in 1969 provided a clear demonstration of this. The documents passed at the Meeting give a generalisation of the tremendous experience accumulated by the communist movement, a profound analysis of contemporary world development and a militant programme for joint struggle against imperialist aggression and oppression, and for national and social emancipation, peace, democracy and socialism.

The ceaseless efforts of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to ensure the constant growth of the defence capacity of the socialist states—to ensure that the Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact are provided with the latest arms and equipment, to ensure the constant improvement of their control and moral and political training—are a continuation and expression of this peaceful policy.

The resolution of the 24th Congress of the CPSU on the Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU stressed: "As a result of the collective formulation and implementation of a number of measures in recent years, the *military organisation of the Warsaw Treaty* has been further improved. The armed forces of the allied powers are in a state of high readiness and are capable of guaranteeing the peaceful endeavour of the fraternal peoples." At the same time, the armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty serve as a mighty shield and bulwark of all freedom-loving peoples.

## Chapter V

# THE MONOPOLIES AND WAR

The basic cause of the great majority of wars between nations and classes throughout the history of human society has been private property. It was almost invariably the property-owning classes at a particular stage of historical development—slave-owners, feudal lords, and later the bourgeoisie —who were the instigators of war. The seizure of property—slaves, land, natural resources, created values and so on—was also the chief object of wars. The wars of the twentieth century are no exception to the rule, since their main cause is monopoly and state-monopoly capital.

Lenin defined politics as the concentrated expression of economics. The economic basis of the aggressive policies of imperialism is the vested interest of the big monopolies in the arms race. The production of arms ensures the monopolies large guaranteed profits, speeds up the introduction of new technology and vitalises production, thereby serving as a temporary boost to economic growth and helping postpone overproduction crises. The stimulating effect of the arms race on capitalist economy has been clearly demonstrated during the United States' wars in Korea and Vietnam.

Government arms orders are a form of state interference in the economy which far from worrying the monopolies actually suits their vested interest in the preservation of the capitalist system.

In the USA, the chief bulwark of monopoly capitalism, arms production has assumed an unprecedented scale. Govern-

ment expenditure on preparations for war is constantly on the increase, and amounted to 81,000 million dollars for the 1968/69 financial year, as against 46,000 million dollars for the year 1959/60. Taking into account collateral expenditure, total military expenditure in 1968/69 amounted to 112,000 million dollars out of a total government budget of 184,000 million dollars. No less than nine million people, or eleven per cent of the country's total labour force, are engaged in military sector—in the Armed Forces and the arms industry.

Two figures suffice to show how these colossal amounts contrast with the figures for the war on poverty in the USA: 2,000 million dollars is all the American Government is prepared to spend on the 32 million poor. Other major problems receive equally niggardly attention. Thus, in 1968 some 2,000 million dollars were spent on housing and 5,200 million on education.

The American monopolies do not only produce arms for the home market. Not satisfied with having military bases scattered throughout the world, 429 large ones and some 3,000 minor ones, they have taken to making large arms sales to "loyal" countries. They provide their protégés and "friends" with "free" arms, in order to protect their vested interest in the American empire and the capitalist system. Since 1950, the US has offered other countries military aid to the value of 38,000 million dollars. In the words of Senator McCarthy, the USA has become "the principal source of conventional weapons throughout the world".[1]

In order to increase their influence over the government, the monopolies try to establish close personal contacts with the Defence Department by offering administrative posts to retired officers, and especially generals. An investigation conducted in 1957 showed that a hundred large corporations which had managed to grab 75 per cent of all military orders employed no less than 1,400 ex-officers, including 261 generals. According to the latest available data on the role of the monopolies in arms production in 1968, of the several tens of thousands of contractors and subcontractors to the Pentagon, the hundred largest corporations secured 70 per cent of all orders.

Bourgeois sociologists and economists in the service of the arms industry monopolies and the militarists advance all sorts of

---

[1] E. McCarthy, *The Limits of Power. America's Role in the World*, New York, 1967, p. 32.

mendacious arguments in justification of the arms race, imperialist aggression and war.

Ever since Keynes expounded his theory of "controlled capitalism", numerous bourgeois economists have produced all sorts of arguments in favour of his views. They present his theory with their own pet modifications, which merely serve to make it even more preposterous, frequently criticise Keynes himself and one another, and invent all sorts of sophisms and deliberately fallacious arguments in defence of militarism.

After the Second World War they were practically unanimous in keeping up a constant stream of praise for military expenditure, maintaining that it stimulated economic development, prevented overproduction crises, and was a firm guarantee of economic prosperity. Many American and West European economists insist that even a reduction of military expenditure, let alone complete or partial disarmament, might well lead to economic disaster.

It is easy enough to see the source of inspiration of these economists and other ideologists of militarism. One has only to consult the figures and see who is lining their pockets from the production of arms and the fanning of wars. Suffice it to note that the minimum estimate for the clear profits made by the arms industry corporations over the last fifteen years is 100,000 million dollars.

The blood of Vietnamese and of American soldiers who are dying in the colonial war in Vietnam brings fabulous profits for the war business. Escalation of the war there has its counterpart in escalation of the earnings of all connected with military-industrial capital, which has spread like a giant cancer through the social organism of the United States.

Some American corporations—firms like Martin-Marietta, North American Aviation, Lockhead, and Boeing—depend almost entirely for their existence on military orders.

The generals and senior officers are also securing higher and higher salaries for themselves. Thus, in 1965, the generals got a further annual pay increase of 2,000 dollars, the colonels 700 dollars, and so on.

These amounts are insignificant, however, compared to the sums that can be earned by the military for using "a little influence" to secure military orders. The periodic court cases and disclosures that appear in the press represent only a fraction of the machinations and secret deals that accompany military orders and deliveries.

The large role played by the arms manufacturers in causing two world wars is common knowledge. There is the notable and much written-of example of the dealings of Basil Zakharoff, who at the end of the last century rose from a proprietor of shady dives in Constantinople to a leading arms dealer. He financed both the hostile camps, helped provoke numerous military conflicts, and was rewarded for his "services" with British Orders, the French Legion d'Honneur and 296 other medals and Orders of thirty-one countries.

Yet compared to the modern nuclear missile kings, the cannon kings of the past such as Zakharoff and Krupp are mere dwarfs as regards the scale and scope of their activities. If in the past millions died in order that a few might live in the lap of luxury, your grasping modern Zakharoffs and Krupps are preparing death for hundreds of millions.

While insisting on the important role of the arms corporations, it is necessary at the same time to bear in mind the aggressive, violent nature of monopoly capital as a whole. The militarised state apparatus is the weapon of the whole monopoly bourgeoisie. Although it is only a small group of monopoly capitalists that is deriving direct benefit from militarisation, the scale and scope of militarisation, the state armaments programme and military policy are dictated by the political and military strategy interests of the whole of monopoly capital. The military-industrial monopolies merely represent the most adventuristic and reactionary force of the modern monopoly bourgeoisie.

Militarism has deeply penetrated American science. In 1968, two-thirds of the total of 28,000 million dollars allotted for scientific research were spent on military research. The great majority of the vast army of scientists and engineers, over half a million strong, is engaged in research connected in one way or another with the arms industry. According to the American journalist J. Ridgeway, research work for military departments is being conducted at universities and colleges in the United States. Sixteen scientific research establishments, with numerous ex-government employees on their staffs, are working on contracts for the Pentagon. By offering high salaries American monopoly capital is attracting large numbers of scientists and engineers from other capitalist countries, mainly with a view to using their knowledge and talent for the development of military weapons.

The American militarists openly congratulate themselves on

the fact that top secret bacteriological laboratories have developed lethal bacilli and viruses that could wipe out the population of whole continents in no time. Meanwhile, expenditure for the war on widespread diseases is being cut back yearly. Thus, in 1962, the budget of the National Institute of Health was slashed by 60 million dollars, of which 15 to 20 million came from the cancer research programme. *The New York Times* wrote that of 450,000 cancer cases every year, 75,000 more die than would be the case if sufficient money was devoted to the struggle against the disease.[1]

American chemists are perfecting the technology of mass murder by means of gas and other poisonous substances. There are factories producing nerve gas for the US armed forces.

It goes without saying that the United States continues to spend the largest sums—thousands of millions of dollars annually—on developing nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles.

Yet the military-industrial business is still not satisfied with its vast earnings and profits, and the militarised American press is demanding that more and more of the taxpayers' money should find its way into the safes of the war industry monopolies and their hirelings. The *US News & World Report* listed seven kinds of weapon which, despite protests from the military, the US Government was supposed to have cancelled, although they were already in the process of development. Three further kinds of weapon were mentioned whose production had been suspended on government instructions. The magazine went on to enumerate fourteen extremely important weapons the government was not paying sufficient attention to. These included plasma missiles, machines capable of causing an earthquake, giant tidal waves and permanent dense cloud; death rays, military bases on the moon, submarine aircraft-carriers, neutron bombs, and space bombs, capable of burning a city from a height of 250 miles.

Although the lion's share of the total sum spent by the US Department of Defence on military research goes on developing the technology of death and destruction, bourgeois economists and sociologists receive a considerable amount. Research in the social sciences has the purpose of conditioning public opinion in

---

[1] *The New York Times*, October 14, 1965 and November 4, 1961.

favour of militarisation, the arms race and support for military conflicts, fanning chauvinism and racism, and proving that war is as necessary as the air we breathe and as inevitable as atmospheric phenomena.

From conversations with professors and teachers and scientific research workers at various institutes and "foundations" it emerges that many aspects of their research programmes are wholly financed by the Pentagon.

Money flows into the pockets of bourgeois economists, sociologists, historians, philosophers and geographers not only via purely military channels but also via the United States Information Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, various foundations created by corporations and multi-millionaires, such as the Rockefeller Foundation and the Ford Foundation, and numerous other establishments.

In the spring of 1966, the American press got hold of certain information on contracts concluded between the CIA and the universities for the financing of "research programmes". The CIA had a secret contract with the University of Michigan, whereby the university was to train CIA police spies for work in Vietnam. Even a number of American anthropologists working abroad complained that they had been forced to sign contracts and inform the CIA of the results of their research. Stanford and other universities had secret contracts with the CIA. These disclosures caused a storm of indignant protest from students and conscientious citizens. The international research centre of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology was even forced to announce that it was ending its contracts with the CIA as from June 1966, including its contracts for "communist studies".

A huge army of representatives of the social sciences with publishing houses and magazines, the press, radio, TV and the cinema at its disposal is working in the service of the arms industry. The situation is similar in other industrial capitalist countries. Well-paid scholars, at the imperialists' beck and call, are doing their utmost to convince the public that military spending is vitally necessary and should be increased.

The henchmen of the monopolies and the military are always ready to assure the public that the high level of state military expenditure that has been maintained since the war in the United States has played a major role in the avoidance of periodic economic crises. They completely ignore the need to study the two-way influence of the civilian market and the

military market in close connection with changes in surplus value and the impact of surplus profits on the production cycle and the occurrence of crises. Instead of making a thoroughgoing analysis, they merely make the bold claim that the military market plays a stabilising role since it remains unaffected by general crises while the market for civilian products contracts. They ignore the fact that even if the military market is not affected the main tendency of capitalist production remains the same, the tendency, that is, for effective demand to fall behind supply, immediately causing overproduction crises.

Let us take a look at the inner mechanism of the way military consumption affects the development of the economy as a whole in practice. In a situation where output to supply the Armed Forces is growing year after year at a higher rate than output for civilian consumption and the military market is expanding more rapidly than the civilian market, capitalist military production attracts ever greater capital investment. Surplus value created in the arms industry only accounts for a small part of investments, a large part being represented by surplus value derived from civilian production. Not only is capital invested in the arms industry instead of other industries, but capital already invested in other industries may be transferred to military production, whenever there is a large demand for new weapons, a sharp increase in the Armed Forces, large-scale stockpiling of arms or an outbreak of war.

In such circumstances military production and expenditure have a temporary stimulating effect on the development of capitalist production, and may alter the production cycle and create the illusion of prosperity.

Yet it is perfectly plain that the military market cannot continue to develop at higher rates than the civilian market for any extended period. This, for the simple reason that it eventually not only curbs but even brings to a halt the accumulation of capital for investment in the development of the productive forces. Where military demand is particularly high it may even cause a reduction in capital accumulation affecting the whole of society.

Capital invested in military production (which Marx described as that part of the wealth of nations that is thrown away to the four winds) has to be constantly replenished from public funds. The capitalist state does this chiefly out of the portion of the national income that should be spent on the working people, thus adversely affecting their standard of living. This

can be done within certain limits, these being set by the minimum necessary for the reproduction of the labour force.

But what happens to the capitalist production cycle when the market for military output remains steady for a long time or only expands gradually at the same rate as the civilian market?

Such a situation can naturally have only a very slight limiting effect on overproduction crises. Military production then produces sufficient surplus value to cover its own investment needs. Indeed, it may more than cover its own needs and have some to spare for investment in other industries. In any case, military production cannot attract surplus capital accumulated in the production cycle of civilian industries.

In any case, whatever the situation may be at a particular time, one thing remains invariably true of military production as regards its influence on extended reproduction: it is very largely lost for social production, being either kept until it is obsolete, or destroyed. Military production is essentially an unproductive, parasitic type of production.

Plainly, the greater the diversion of productive forces to unproductive purposes, the less reproduction there is resulting in slower growth, rates, inflation, and a levelling out or even decline in the standard of living.

Some Western economists prescribe military expenditure as a cure for modern capitalism from its ailments of cyclical crises and unemployment: what they are in fact prescribing is the systematic bleeding white of the capitalist states by gradual economic strangulation. Withdrawal from reproduction, the destruction or freezing of a large portion of output in order to enable this system of production to survive really amounts to gradual suicide of the system itself.

All this answers the question: what would be the economic consequences of disarmament for the capitalist countries? A UN consultative group (consisting of ten experts, from the USSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and seven capitalist countries including the USA, Britain, France and Pakistan) lifted the heavy curtain of falsehood and deception woven by the advocates of the arms monopolies and the militarists by declaring in the conclusion of their special report "Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament" in 1962: "There should thus be no doubt that the diversion to peaceful purposes of the resources now in military use could be accomplished to the benefit of all countries and lead to the improvement of world economic and social conditions. The achievement of general and complete

disarmament would be an unqualified blessing to all mankind."[1]

This report, which was unanimously approved in the same year by the UN General Assembly, is an international document of major importance and has enabled the public in capitalist countries to gain a correct understanding of the economic role of the arms race and the consequences of disarmament.

The publication of this report dealt a serious blow to all advocates of the arms race and opponents of disarmament. Speeches were even made in Congress, mentioning the tremendous benefits disarmament would bring the American economy. Critics of militarism are pointing out that several sectors of the American economy require large state investment in order to make them healthy and ensure their development. American scientists have calculated that measures to put an end to water and air pollution which has reached an extremely serious level in the United States would require 50,000 million dollars, that 1,000 million dollars is needed to improve navigation on the Ohio River, that tens of millions is needed for the building of schools and other educational establishments and to train enough teachers to make up for the present shortage, to give but a few examples.

Further convincing arguments against militarism and the arms race are to be found in Seymour Melman's *Our Depleted Society*, and in numerous other books and articles that have appeared in the USA recently.

The declaration of the XVII Session of the UN General Assembly noted that the vast sums of money thrown into the insatiable maw of war and the efforts of tens of millions of people now being spent on preparations for destruction could serve to improve life on our earth beyond recognition in a very short time if they were diverted to peaceful purposes. In 1966, the direct military expenditure of all the countries of the world amounted to 140,000 million dollars. The declaration, which was unanimously supported, admitted that the arms race is robbing mankind and that disarmament would lead to economic growth for all countries and to the flourishing of culture, science and civilisation.

General and complete disarmament would be of special benefit to the economies of the developing countries. In

---

[1] *Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament*, Report of the UN Secretary General transmitting the study of his consultative group, Vienna. 1962, p. 57.

1966 the military budget of these countries amounted to some 8,000 million dollars, more than half their present annual capital investments. Besides making available these vast sums, disarmament would make it possible to divert to the backward areas of the world a considerable portion of the means the industrial countries would save by ending the arms race. Annual economic aid to the less developed countries in the form of mutually advantageous loans and credits could be more than double the present amount offered in the form of capital investments.

If freed from the need to spend vast amounts on defence, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries would be in a position to greatly increase their aid to the less developed areas of the globe.

More and more people in the capitalist countries are coming to realise what a tremendous burden military expenditure places on their economies. Yet monopoly circles in the USA—the most militarised country in the world—are so hostile to the idea of cutting back military expenditure that they not only insist that the arms race continue in their own country but are doing their utmost to exert pressure on other countries, especially those of the North Atlantic bloc, to increase their already excessively inflated military budgets.

The growth of militarism in the USA, and certain other capitalist countries, the criminal war against the peoples of Indochina, military provocations in Latin America, reactionary *coups* in Africa and Asia engineered by the CIA, and aggression in the Middle East—all this testifies to the increasingly aggressive nature of imperialism and the hardening of reaction. The 23rd Congress of the CPSU made the following analysis of the international situation: "The deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, the exacerbation of its contradictions, are driving imperialism to greater adventurism and adding to the danger it presents to peace and social progress. More and more frequently imperialism seeks an escape in armed provocations, all kinds of conspiracies and outright armed interventions."[1]

An important factor in the political life of the Western countries is that along with the malignant growth of militarisation, opposition to this process on the part of the democratic and peace-loving forces is stiffening. Examples of this are the wide protest movement against the American war in Vietnam, both in other countries and America herself, where it has spread to

[1] *23rd Congress of the CPSU*, p. 286.

all sections of the public, from private company owners to the trade unions.

The war in Vietnam, which has cost the United States over 100,000 million dollars, has clearly revealed the defects inherent in capitalist society. It has shown that the arms race can never really cure, let alone save capitalism. The American economy has revealed serious inflationary tendencies; there has been a heavy run on gold, and gold reserves have dropped sharply, from 23,000 million dollars in 1953 to 10,500 million in 1968.

The main political result of the war in Vietnam has been to reveal the futility of the attempts by American imperialism both to defeat socialism on a world-wide scale and to "deter" socialism by means of local wars.

## Chapter VI

# BOURGEOIS PHILOSOPHY AND PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE

Bourgeois philosophers are no longer able nowadays to limit themselves to abstract theorising on the subject of war and peace. They often supplement their theoretical conclusions with concrete political programmes.

In the present article the theoretical and practical propositions of several modern bourgeois doctrines of war and peace are held up for comparison. This should enable us to determine to what extent certain modern bourgeois philosophical theories correspond to the requirements of international and internal state affairs.

A philosopher's political views—in the case in point, his answer to the problem of war and peace—depend to a large extent on how he understands the "essence of being", the possibilities and limits of cognition and the nature of social ideals and social development.

The main bourgeois philosophico-sociological theories can be roughly divided into two groups according to how they view social progress, its motive forces, and hence the causes of war. The first comprises theories of an objective-fatalist character, the second subjective-voluntarist attitudes.

Philosophers of the first group see the motive forces of history, its real sense and content as lying in extra-historical factors, such as Divine Providence, the development of the Absolute Spirit, and the aims and intentions of Nature. The second group view history in terms of social phenomena, in terms of inevitable inherent biological and psychological characteristics of the individual personality, his free moral and spiritual activity.

Many contemporary bourgeois philosophers reject the traditional forms of idealism, and are opposed to both the abstract *a priori* metaphysical systems and various brands of "spiritual subjectivism". Their theories are based on humanist emphasis of the free development of the human personality.

These trends in contemporary bourgeois philosophy, whatever their real essence and direction, are all forms of reaction to the tremendous social changes that have taken place in the world in the last fifty years. The results of scientific and technological progress, and especially the dramatic situation that arose in the world with the appearance of the atom bomb and rocketry have had a tremendous influence on the philosophical and political views of bourgeois philosophers.

There are no grounds at all for doubting the peace-loving intentions of many contemporary bourgeois philosophers. Yet as regards their views on the question of war and peace we must judge not only according to their subjective intentions but also the objective role their philosophies and political programmes play and their practical attitude to existing political systems.

K. Jaspers, one of the founders of existentialism, devotes a great deal of attention both to the theoretical and to the concrete political aspects of the problem of war and peace. His theories are interesting for two reasons: firstly, they contain practically all the typical features of modern bourgeois philosophy and, secondly, the political aspects of the problem we are here concerned with are more closely combined with its philosophical aspects than is often the case.

Like many other modern bourgeois philosophers, Jaspers rejects metaphysics, and all kinds of frozen, doctrinaire philosophical systems. He does not consider his ideas to form a philosophy of things but regards them rather as a philosophy of the human personality purporting to reveal the real meaning of human existence.

Jaspers sought the real underlying essence and value of human existence not in the spheres that are completely alien to man (among which, by the way, he includes the outward phenomena of social life), but in the human personality, free and independent of these forms. According to him, man acquires his real place in the world, his real essence, only by freeing himself from the forms of social life, which are "absolutely alien" to him.

Jaspers holds that man comes to understand the meaning of life by what he calls "existentialist illumination" which he may experience for short moments in certain situations. This illumination may occur in moments of passionate love, deep mutual understanding, in so-called frontier situations—times when a man comes face to face with death and suffering in his day-by-day struggle for survival.

Thus, a man may come to understand the meaning of life when he comes face to face with death. Death affects all of us and serves as a frontier situation insofar as its entry into our lives reveals the limited nature of our existence. Man is aware of death as a frontier situation not at the time of his own death, since "when I die, I experience death but do not perceive it",[1] but when somebody else dies with whom he is connected by existential communion. Thus, we retain a connection with someone who has passed away in spite of his death. Death helps us determine what is existential in life and what is not. "What remains essential in the face of death, is existential and what becomes valueless and vain is naked existence."[2]

However existential illumination comes to a person, whether in a positive or negative way, it always produces a revelation of the tragic nature of human life. After the brief flash of existential illumination, a man is once more plunged into the darkness of his day-to-day existence. Jaspers holds that the way out of this tragic situation lies via the world of the Absolute and the Eternal: he regards existential illumination as being essentially irrational and occurring at those special moments when a ray of light from the world of the Absolute breaks through the wall of everyday existence. Jaspers insists that this world has nothing at all to do with the metaphysical spheres found in the doctrinaire systems of the past, and that the various objects and phenomena of human life are but cyphers resisting rational definition that give us an insight into the Beyond.[3]

Jaspers had a horror of rigid scientific and philosophical assertions, definite conclusions or results, with their doctrinaire implications. While science is concerned with investigating the relationship between things, he intended his philosophy to

---

[1] K. Jaspers, *Philosophie*, Band II, München, 1932, S. 222.
[2] Ibid., S. 223.
[3] Ibid., Band III, S. 1-2.

reveal the basic factors underlying human behaviour. Science has a universal compulsive value, while philosophy leads beyond compulsion to freedom; science raises the edifice of actual knowledge, whereas philosophy destroys all edifices of truth to cast man back into a state of uncertainty.

In his profound aversion to dogmatism and his attempt to create a completely non-doctrinaire philosophy, Jaspers unwittingly arrives at an extremely one-sided philosophy, which is really a kind of relativist dogmatism. By insisting that no attitude or assertion is rigidly applicable and final, he is in fact rejecting the objective value of his own philosophy. This had an important influence on his political views, and not least on his theory of war and peace.

Jaspers creates an unbridgeable chasm between knowledge and existence, between the existent, concrete forms of social life and what ought to be. He seeks the motive forces and principles of moral behaviour in the existent individual. This tendency to contrast different sides of the historical process—the internal and the external, civilisation and the moral and spiritual development of mankind, historical necessity and individual freedom—is typical of modern bourgeois philosophy and sociology as a whole.

These typical features of Jaspers' philosophy influenced his approach to contemporary political problems, despite the fact that his views and judgements of political questions were mainly based on realistic, concrete analysis of the various factors and phenomena of contemporary internal state and international life.

Jaspers' theory of war and peace is developed in several of his post-war works—*The Atom Bomb and the Future of Mankind* (1961), the *Vital Problems of German Politics* (1963) and *Hopes and Fears* (1965), both comprising various articles and speeches of various periods. His last work, "Where Is the German Federal Republic Heading?", was published in three successive numbers of *Der Spiegel* in 1966, and represents an important supplement to the afore-mentioned works, showing considerable evolution of his views towards radical criticism of the undemocratic, militarist policies of West Germany and resolute support for peace.[1]

[1] K. Jaspers, *Die Atombombe und die Zukunft des Menschen*, München, 1961; *Lebensfragen der deutschen Politik*, München, 1963; *Hoffnung und Sorge*, München, 1965; *Der Spiegel*, 1966, Nos. 17, 18, 19.

Jaspers' concrete political programme is summed up in the following proposals. Firstly, existing treaties should remain in force until replaced through further talks; secondly, the establishment of principles of international law involving the renunciation by states of absolute sovereignty, namely, the acceptance of decisions taken by the majority of members of an international legal organisation, abolition of the right of veto, and, of course, the establishment of such an international organisation wielding unprecedented powers; thirdly, unlimited exchange of ideas, and their free and public confrontation without any form of censorship; fourthly, legalisation of intervention by supranational forces in the internal affairs of individual states in cases where the latter have failed to act in accordance with the universally accepted principles of justice; fifthly, unjust frontiers and agreements imposed in the past be considered as subject to review and subjected nations be liberated by supranational decision. Jaspers regards free elections by secret ballot to be the most suitable means of expressing the will of the people. He considers that the above measures, if put into effect, would not only avert war but would serve to abolish it altogether. The world faces the alternative of a world order or a world war.[1]

What then are the essential conditions for the creation of such a world order? Jaspers discusses them in detail in his article "Truth, Freedom and Peace". Peace throughout the world, he writes, begins with peace in one's own home, and peace is founded on freedom. Internal and external peace can only be ensured on the basis of the existential freedom of each and every individual. Beginning with the individual, freedom is embodied in republican government within a state and is also expressed in this state's opposition to the oppression of other peoples.

But freedom does not mean arbitrary behaviour, real freedom necessarily involves fidelity to the truth: "No peace without freedom, but no freedom without truth."[2] Peace is an empty word unless it supposes truth, unless it derives from truth and serves it.

Now let us proceed to make a concrete analysis of these ideas of Jaspers we have briefly listed above, for they really require it. What does he mean by this truth without which there can

---

[1] K. Jaspers, *Lebensfragen der deutschen Politik*, München, 1963, S. 143.
[2] Ibid., S. 161.

be no freedom or peace? On the basis of what principles does he propose to create his international control bodies, his world order? What frontiers and what agreements fixed and concluded in the past does Jaspers consider unjust? Only if we know something about Jaspers' attitude to existing political and state systems shall we be able to understand the real content with which his "peace programme" is imbued.

Firstly, then: What is truth? Jaspers answers this question in full accordance with his anti-doctrinaire philosophy, which rejects all dogmatic assertions. "We are always only on the way to truth. Nobody possesses it, everyone is searching for it."[1] According to Jaspers' philosophical credo, the truth is what promotes man's ascent to existence.

Vague and hazy though these ideas may be, they nevertheless have the merit of excluding the possibility of dogmatic insistence on one particular answer as the only just one, and thus leave the door open for discussion of this universal problem. It is taken on faith that all states are to a greater or lesser degree intent on finding the truth. Jaspers warns us that exclusive insistence on one's own point of view being true *a priori* completely excludes the possibility of ever attaining the truth.

Yet Jaspers is convinced *a priori* of the exclusive value of Western ideals and principles of social life, and does not regard socialism as resolving or as capable of resolving many basic contradictions of modern society. Without taking the trouble to make a concrete analysis of the state systems of whole continents, with the prejudice that is typical of modern bourgeois philosophy in general, he talks glibly about the "Free West" and the "totalitarian East", about "European democratic traditions" and "Afro-Asian nationalist expansiveness". The following sample should suffice to illustrate this. "Under the shadow of the atom bomb, the danger of the totalitarian forces depriving the world of freedom is increased. As long as war is waged by masses of people with conventional weapons, using modern technology but not the atom bomb, the totalitarians have the advantage. In such a war events will inevitably lead to a point when the free countries will be faced with the choice of using the bomb or accepting totalitarianism.... To risk the destruction of humanity or to sacrifice freedom? Everyone is agreed that the bomb must go. But there is no such unanimity when the question arises: what should we do when it is a

[1] K. Jaspers, op. cit., S. 161.

matter of the life or death of freedom? The bomb destroys life, but the destruction of freedom by totalitarianism makes it worthless even if not for ever.... The moment of the monstrous decision must come. There is no avoiding it for anybody".[1] Thus Jaspers' "flexible anti-doctrinaire" philosophy gives way to absolute conviction, without any doubts or hesitation, in the truth of the bourgeois "freedom" of the West and the "totalitarianism" of the East. Free countries are faced with the choice of using the bomb or sacrificing their freedom.

In his latter years Jaspers severely criticised the West German political system. He pointed out that the Federal Republic was heading via party oligarchy to dictatorship. This could result in "the gravest threat to peace", and produce "the final, and this time fatal disaster for Germany".

Yet Jaspers ascribed all these "corruptions of the West German parliamentary system", as he called them, not to socio-economic factors of capitalist society, to the attempt of the ruling class to use the system in their own interests, but to the undesirable internal evolution of the leading parties, bourgeois-democratic institutions, attitudes, and so on. Jaspers made no mention of those objective factors of capitalist society and the Western way of life which in a certain international or internal political situation will inevitably lead to the destruction of bourgeois democratic freedoms and the institution of some form of dictatorship. For it is in fact this exclusively Western and at the same time anti-Communist (socio-economic and political) orientation of the reactionary forces in West Germany that is the real source of the trouble that Jaspers found so disturbing. Here we come across that very categorical, doctrinaire attitude and shortsightedness that Jaspers so opposed in his philosophy. In theory, the truth for Jaspers is not a given quantity, already fixed and defined, but something that is constantly in the process of being produced and revealed, constantly "becoming". In practice, however, he declares the existing social principles and ideals of the "Free West" to be the only ones that are true and acceptable.

With due consideration to the age we live in with its real threat of universal destruction, Jaspers calls for energetic action in the cause of peace. He warns that any complacency, apathy or irresponsibility in the frontier situation that obtains in the

[1] K. Jaspers, "Wohin treibt die Bundesrepublik?", *Der Spiegel*, Nr. 19, 1966, S. 85.

world today could have the direst consequences. Here, in order to emphasise the grave danger of the situation, Jaspers resorts to scientific facts and real concrete factors, analyses the role and significance of various social organisations and institutions, and calls for sober judgement and the maximum rationality. At the same time, in his philosophy he insists that a man can only find his real *raison d'être* in life, outside of science, in the moments of existential illumination that occur in frontier situations. His existentialist philosophy destroys all edifices of truth to throw man into a state of uncertainty and constant anxiety.

It can certainly be a very good thing to criticise thoughtless optimism, blind faith in historical progress, taking for granted the triumphant march of mankind towards happiness and prosperity. This kind of optimism dulls vigilance, and leads to apathy and inactivity such as cannot be tolerated in our time. However, by constantly hurling man into a state of anxiety and uncertainty, existentialism produces pessimism and a sense of despair differing but slightly in its consequences from thoughtless optimism.

Frontier situations—like death, suffering, guilt, the struggle for survival—can all undoubtedly help us understand life, appreciate and prize it, provided that these situations do not crush man, make him lose all interest in life, or scar him morally or physically, which, after all, is an equally frequent consequence of various forms of human suffering.

The philosophy of frontier situations constantly makes itself felt in Jaspers' political works. Fear is essential for a real peace policy, he writes. Deliverance from fear increases serenity and lack of concern and blocks the path to a policy of peace.

One cannot but agree with Jaspers that a profound awareness of the grave danger that exists in the modern world undoubtedly increases our vigilance and sense of moral responsibility for our decisions and actions. But it does not follow from this that people should be held in constant fear and apprehension. The spreading of fear and uncertainty which Jaspers so strongly advocates is quite incompatible with a consistent peace policy.

Jaspers' philosophy is regarded as an optimistic brand of German existentialism (in contrast to Heidegger). Yet this optimism is purely formal and does not spring from the actual essence of his philosophy. Indeed, Jaspers himself admits that his existential illumination reveals all the tragedy of human

existence. Jaspers looks at life through the eyes of a dying man and assesses it from the standpoint of death, whereas true optimism consists in assessing life from the standpoint of life. Faced with the death of a man who is existentially linked with us, faced with our own extinction, we can certainly achieve a heightened awareness of what was essential in life and what was not. Awareness of the finite nature of our existence also helps us to value time and to value life. But there is always the other side of the medal: horror of death makes it impossible to make an objective appraisal of what has been achieved and of the possibilities that exist, and paralyses man, while awareness of the finite, limited nature of our own existence often leads to egoism and indifference towards the fate of future generations.

Jaspers also speaks of love as the heart and soul of existential communion. He is all for taking risks and going out towards others, trusting in them and relying on them to be reasonable. This is all very well in that reason and mutual trust may indeed help to bring individuals and nations closer together and thus aid the solution of various human problems including the extremely vital one of peace: but what of the numerous instances of irrational behaviour by individuals and states, what of cases of breach of trust which one meets so frequently in life?

Jaspers is perfectly aware of all this; yet even so he sets great hopes on the strengthening of trust and reason in the world through existential communion. But how can we be so sure that in a critical situation, in the moment of existential illumination, man will not perceive in his soul a truth that contradicts real reason? After all, his reaction to a frontier situation is largely predetermined by his social environment, by that very existence in family, church and state which Jaspers calls "alien existence".

Jaspers seeks to affirm the objective significance of existential illumination by referring to our connection with the Absolute: he suggests we should rely on philosophic faith, on a miracle helping us from above. For him, existential communion is not man's well-earned right but a gratuitous gift of fortune. What of those who have not been so favoured?

Once again, Jaspers contradicts himself on this point, since in his practical judgements he suggests a different answer. "Can we rely on spontaneous, unforeseen changes, appearing by magic, in the development of mankind, life on Earth and the Universe, on salvation sent from the transcendental in the

moment of disaster?"[1] On the one hand, Jaspers regards the things, phenomena and events around us as irrational cyphers, that somehow inform us of our real calling. On the other hand, he insists quite categorically that in expectation of something beyond our understanding we cannot act according to reason: "This expectation would imprison us in illusions of our own making, and deprive us of our ability to act."[2]

The anguish with which Jaspers says that war in the atomic age will lead to universal destruction and that we must "do absolutely everything we can to save the world" is perfectly understandable. But this unconditional demand for peace presupposes a correspondingly principled appraisal of existing socio-political systems, recognition of the need for their peaceful coexistence with all ensuing consequences.

Wherever Jaspers is reckoning with facts and basing himself on a realistic appraisal of things, he frequently puts forward ideas that are not only inconsistent with his philosophy but actually contradict and preclude it, showing it to be untenable in practice. At the same time, many indisputable propositions of his philosophy lose their value and practical significance as soon as their concrete content is revealed.

Jaspers speaks of his desire to free man from external factors of life that exert compulsion on him. He tries to find the root causes of man's behaviour within the human personality and to assert the individual's freedom and independence. In actual fact, however, by rejecting the social forms of human existence as absolutely alien and plunging into the existential depths of individual being, he loses sight of man and merely acquires philosophic faith which again points to a realm of absolute values and ideals that lies somewhere in the Beyond. Jaspers' philosophical belief merely exchanges outward fatalism for inner fatalism which is even far stronger and more difficult to overcome.

The existentialists try to understand and explain social development not from the standpoint of society as a whole but from the standpoint of perception and understanding of the existent, individual, human personality with its personal perception and views. A similar view of the individual and society is held by the personalists (Caulkins, Hocking, Brightman, Flewelling, Kent, Roy, etc.). They too place man's problems, the problems

[1] K. Jaspers, *Lebensfragen der deutschen Politik*, S. 155.
[2] Ibid.

of his life, happiness and freedom in the centre of their philosophies. The personalist philosophy also rejects absolute idealism and metaphysical materialism, refusing to regard the individual personality as a manifestation of the Absolute.

According to the personalists, the Universe contains certain spiritual realities, which in the final analysis are of an essentially personal nature and represent the selfperceiving thought, feeling and volition of certain Egos. Moreover, the Universe itself is completely spiritual and personal by its very nature and represents an all-embracing, finite Ego.

While personifying and spiritualising the Universe, the personalists constantly stress the irreducibility of the spiritual to the non-spiritual and material. Matter is a purely mechanical and inert force, while the personality is the concrete active force that creates new qualities. It is from this contraposition of active spirit and inert matter that Brightman draws his philosophical concept of history. According to him, a conflict is going on in the soul of every man between good and evil, between things of value and things that are worthless. This constant struggle going on within us is extended to society and determines our attitude to nature.

Brightman regards the 20th century as an age of conflicting values. As he writes in his *Introduction to Philosophy:* "Freedom, reason, the rights of man, the worship of God, the love of truth, beauty, and goodness—all of man's highest values—are threatened by 'military necessity', the totalitarian state, materialistic theories and practices, and ruthless competition."[1] There is a constant struggle in man between the spiritual and materialism, between religion and the secular, between light and darkness. The meaning of history lies in putting an end to this conflict and achieving an acceptable union of these opposite sides of life. According to Brightman, this should be done by developing the best sides of each person, and following those principles whereby true values can be created. He hopes that the present world conflict can be resolved in this way. He believes that behind every war there lies peace, that beyond chaos lies order, and on the other side of apparent contradictions the truth is to be found. Both Brightman and Flewelling, despite their sincere desire to find a solution to the conflict, merely succeed in underlining its inevitability.

---

[1] E. S. Brightman, *An Introduction to Philosophy*, New York, 1951, pp. VII, VIII.

According to them, the struggle between the destructive and the creative force within man and society is inherent in their very nature. War and peace succeed one another with the regularity of the tides. "Civilisations fall as well as rise. The sting of this fact now looming on the general intellectual horizon gives poignancy to the disillusionment of our times."[1]

The problem of peace for them is closely linked with their theories of historical progress, and they provide no practical positive solution to the problem.

The personalists consider growing alienation to be to blame for all social evils. Hocking maintains that alienation arose from man's attempt to know God as an object different from himself, as something which can be not only man's companion but his worst enemy, more terrible than death or any other natural phenomenon. The solution he offers is for religion to be restored to its leading role in society, for another kind of communion between man and the Absolute, his mystical union with the deity. Once again we find philosophy turning to faith as mankind's only road to salvation.

Personalism reveals its essential kinship with existentialism not only in its fundamental premises but also in its insistence on the tragic, fortuitous and insecure nature of human existence, the importance of reason and ineradicable alienation between man and the world.

Modern objective idealism is closely allied to the subjective-idealist philosophies such as those discussed above. One of the most influential trends of objective idealism in the present century has been the Anglo-American neo-realism. There has been a great revival of interest in the USA in recent years in the theories of the well-known American neo-realist philosopher Alfred North Whitehead. In the framework of his Platonic realist philosophy, Whitehead attempts to resolve some of the fundamental social questions of our day.

For Whitehead the problem of peace is a theological rather than a practical one. He holds that mankind will live in peace as long as it is capable of intuitively grasping peaceful aims.

Whitehead's objective idealism is not identical with the Platonic variety, despite his Platonic approach. He adopts

---

[1] Ralph Tyler Flewelling, *The Survival of Western Culture*, New York-London, 1943, p. 5.

a metaphysical standpoint whereby reality can only be interpreted with reference to the ideal. His term for these transcendental qualities is "eternal aims". Whitehead sees the world as a process of constant evolution, representing the combination of "eternal aims" (non-actualised potentialities) with "really real things", the transformation of the potential into the actual. His is a doctrine of "creative advance", a process involving the actualisation of qualitatively new features not presented by the data of the antecedent world. To explain creative advance he introduces the concept of creative ability and God. The process of advance requires that the various characteristics descriptive of life include the "really real" thing, representing the *a priori* basis for the ascent of ideal forms in the definite process of the temporal world. Whitehead describes this process as the continuous destruction of "really real" things which at the same time possess "objective immortality" both in the elements of other "really real" things and above all, in the "nature of God". God is both the source of the appearance of factors of novelty in nature and society and the basis of the immortality of any transient being, social or natural. Real human freedom comes from God, as the source of all harmony in the world.

This philosophy of a "continuously self-destructive" world expresses a pessimistic attitude to social development. Whitehead rejects all hard and fast rules, refusing to accept that any social theories can go any way towards explaining human actions and behaviour in terms of general tendencies of a particular social system. According to him, the rapid transition and constant renewal of the phenomena of modern social life make it impossible to speak of any constant, generally valid factors.

As a result, Whitehead's "metaphysics of social harmony" provides no satisfactory theoretical foundations for a positive peace programme.

Whitehead himself was opposed to war, and placed his hopes for peace in the continuous development of mankind towards common ethical principles. His views on freedom and democracy were far less circumscribed than was the case with many other neo-realist philosophers.

In American philosophy we often find attempts to justify aggressive US "power politics". One of those to do so was George Santayana with his unusual brand of speculative philosophy, according to which behind every existing thing

there lies a more real ideal essence. It is this theory that determines the nature of his "philosophy of life" and his social ideas.

Santayana maintains that no one theory can claim to represent the whole truth, and that science, philosophy, poetry, religion, etc., are only symbolic forms produced by the human imagination for the purpose of understanding and explaining reality. Science, art and religion, despite their various relationships with the world of things, simply represent mythological forms, their value being dependent on the extent to which imagination is present as opposed to reason.

On the basis of a fundamental opposition between the material and the ideal, Santayana distinguishes two levels of social existence—the animal and the spiritual. In the former category he places all forms of social activity, including intellectual activity, that serve to satisfy material needs. In the latter he includes what he considers to be the more elevated forms of creative activity—art, poetry, literature and religion.

He classifies forms of government according to the same criteria. Thus, the more perfect form of government is that in whose activity spiritual rather than animal motives dominate. The aim of social development is the establishment of what he considers to be a rational order originating from irrational human impulses. According to Santayana, nature contains its own ideal, and progressive organisation of irrational impulses produces the rational life. Man is a rational animal, and all his rational life is controlled by the biological, animal life of man in the depths of nature. Irrational impulses are the fundamental and initial factors of human life, that arise irrespective of man's aims and are organised in the "life of reason", "the rational life".

In society, the "life of reason" passes through three stages: the natural stage, the stage of free society, and, finally, the ideal society in which the ideal interests themselves take possession of the mind.

Santayana's theory of the "ideal society" is really an aristocratic elitist doctrine. Santayana considers modern democracy as a means for attracting people to power who are not bearers or inheritors of human culture. Thus, better forms of social life must be introduced in order to preserve mankind's cultural heritage and organise society in a rational manner. Santayana regards the policy of force to be fundamental to international relations. The United States could assume the role of world

leader and intervene "in the traditional life of all other nations not only by selling there innumerable American products, but by recommending, if not imposing, American ways of living and thinking".[1]

Santayana considers universal peace to be incompatible with freedom and unattainable under general democracy. Peace will reign on earth only when "the flower" of humanity—the intellectual elite—impose their rational rule by force. Santayana appears to be championing the elitist cause; in fact, he is defending the policy of force conducted by the most extreme elements in the ruling groups of capitalist countries.

Obviously, the only way to really defend peace and mankind's spiritual values is through democracy. Peace and progress can only be achieved by democratic and peaceful settlement of internal state and international disagreements. This is especially true in the atomic age.

While in existentialism, personalism, critical realism and other modern philosophies, the traditional propositions of objective idealism are either transformed or combined with elements of subjective realism, the theories of Whitehead and various other religious philosophers are generally within the bounds of traditional idealism. The Christian existentialism of Paul Tillich, Reinhold Niebuhr's "theology of crisis", and the neo-Thomist theories do not differ essentially from the traditional religious philosophies.

Tillich and Niebuhr speak of sin as alienation from God, which has brought mankind to a state of crisis. "In an age of atomic energy and total wars it is pathetic that our technique has made it possible for one finger to press one button and destroy millions of people while our wisdom has not given birth to the knowledge that no man is safe if any man is unsafe."[2]

They go on to propose what they consider to be the only way out of this situation. Mankind can be saved, they say, only if it finds within itself the strength to free itself from this sin, and develops in itself the necessary wisdom. Niebuhr insists that man must understand that he is not creator but creature, and must therefore act according to the intentions of the creator, and not try to build a "Tower of Babel" and perish beneath the rubble: ". . .Through the faith in God revealed in the

[1] I. L. Horowitz, *The Idea of War and Peace in Contemporary Philosophy*, New York, 1957, p. 86.

[2] *Ethics*, July 1960, Vol. LXX, No. 4, p. 307.

Christ who died and rose again, death can become the basis of a new life for individuals, for nations, and for civilisations."[1]

The neo-Thomists (Jacques Maritain, Gilson, Copleston and others) also hold that the way to peace and perfect happiness lies through man's constant ascendance towards a pure and perfect life, of which God himself is the embodiment. Maritain holds that peace cannot be achieved "before the time of great crisis and great reconciliation announced by St. Paul".[2]

Under the influence of the theory of universalism which is extremely popular in the West, both neo-Thomists and protestant theologians clamour for the setting up of a "world state".

Despite the original forms in which bourgeois philosophy appears today, in its approach to the problem of war and peace, as indeed in its approach to many other problems, it is based on the same principles as the idealist philosophies of the past. There is still a general tendency to seek the motive forces of history, the essence of human existence, and the objective foundations of human activity directed towards the attainment of perpetual peace in the beyond, in spheres that really lie outside human social and individual existence.

Along with certain positive points, all the philosophical and political solutions to the problem of war and peace offered by bourgeois religious and secular philosophers alike have certain common features which make them quite untenable both in theory and practice. These include: an irrational interpretation of the motive forces and influences at work in the individual and society; a highly pessimistic view of the human condition; a tendency to regard science, technology and existing social forms as factors and forces essentially hostile and absolutely alien to man; an insistence on self-awareness and self-perfection as the chief means of resolving human problem; faith and reliance on salvation from above (from God); dogmatic absolutisation of the ideals of the "Free World" and Christianity, and an abstract idealist approach to concrete political problems.

Unlike many of his philosophical fellow-thinkers, the founder of American neo-realism Ralph Perry was always an ardent champion of a policy of peace and international co-operation. Perry held that peaceful coexistence between the capitalist USA and the socialist USSR was possible on the basis

---

[1] *Ethics*, July 1960, p. 315.

[2] Quoted from I. L. Horowitz, op. cit., p. 79.

of the community of interests existing between the two systems in as far as the general rights of the individual were broadly speaking similar. According to him, both systems were interested in peace rather than war, and co-operation rather than conflict. In present conditions, he said, peace had become more than an ideal good: it was an absolute and paramount necessity.[1]

In this connection, it is well worth taking a look at the views on war and peace of the eminent English philosopher Bertrand Russell. Over the last twenty years Russell's views have evolved considerably, and today he is one of the most active and dedicated supporters of the peace movement, regarding peaceful coexistence as the only way to save civilisation. His philosophical standpoint remains unchanged, however, and he sees the problems of war and peace chiefly in terms of social psychology. He holds that the attainment of peace involves not only fundamental social changes affecting both internal state and international affairs, but changes in man himself and his beliefs, bringing human harmony.

Russell asks: Has Man a Future? and replies that his future will be only what he makes it. If he behaves as a rational being then the outlook is good. If he surrenders to political passions then nuclear war is inevitable.

Russell proposes the following practical measures for achieving peace in our time: first and foremost, nuclear disarmament; secondly, the banning of nuclear tests; thirdly, removal of the threat represented by the doctrine of immediate retaliation; and fourthly, the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons to the countries that do not yet possess them.

Russell writes that the Great Powers often find themselves in a very difficult position today, especially as regards disarmament. Each side is afraid of the other side's nuclear potential and thus strives to increase its own nuclear capacity. The other side naturally does the same, with the result that all steps towards removing the nuclear threat only serve to increase it.

Russell is strongly critical of the view that war is part of human nature, and that human nature cannot be changed. Those who support this view, he says, forget that primitive instinct plays a very small role in the life of civilised man.

The idea that peace is definitely to be prized and that prac-

[1] Ibid., p. 192.

tical steps must be taken against various types of militarism and undemocratic tendencies in contemporary capitalist society is gaining ever wider recognition among certain bourgeois philosophers. In this respect, the standpoints of Bertrand Russell and Jean-Paul Sartre can be considered typical. Both these philosophers combine their theoretical work with social and political activity in the interests of peace and democracy. Their active participation in public condemnation of the American war in Vietnam testifies to their great civil courage and sense of personal responsibility for what happens to mankind. The latter statements of Jaspers also show that he had come much closer to the views of progressive bourgeois thinkers as regards his general attitude to problems of war and peace. In his politico-philosophical works he showed himself to be still under the influence of a narrow approach to developments in international affairs. But nevertheless, the apprehension with which he regarded the rise of undemocratic and militarist forces in the Federal Republic of Germany gradually led him to adopt a somewhat less circumscribed attitude, which definitely affected his views and judgements.

Many reactionary bourgeois philosophers, both by the very nature of their philosophical and political views and by deliberate intent, directly or indirectly justify "power politics" and obstruct the strengthening of international security and the ending of the arms race.

However, progressive philosophers of various schools of thought are tending to join forces over the question of peace, and try to help remove these obstacles to the development and spread of progressive views on the vital problems of our time.

This evolution in their views was considerably encouraged and aided by Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence and the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, directed towards the implementation of that principle. The socio-philosophical propositions of contemporary bourgeois philosophy have on the whole a speculative and abstract *a priori* character and do not include principles that could serve as an adequate basis for a realistic and just political programme for peace. Moreover, there is a tendency for the positive and realistic political theories advanced by some bourgeois philosophers on the basis of a realistic appraisal of the facts of the situation obtaining in the world today to conflict with their philosophical premises.

Problems of war and peace require a concrete historical approach. Contemporary bourgeois philosophy is generally dominated by abstract principles which cannot possibly be expected to lead to realistic solutions.

## Chapter VII

# NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY AND WAR

The cause of wars is a question that looms large in modern bourgeois social thought.

Along with numerous attempts to seek the origin of wars in psychological, demographic and geographical factors, there is also a widespread theory in Western capitalist countries that views national sovereignty as the prime cause of war. The theory is that national sovereignty inevitably leads to international anarchy, and thus the creation of a cosmopolitan, supranational world government would be the most effective means of ensuring peace. The American sociologist Walt Rostow writes that "war, ultimately, arises from the existence and acceptance of the concept of national sovereignty".[1] Some bourgeois scholars regard the dynamic nature of the national state as one of the main philosophical apologetics for war.[2]

How did such a theory originate? What objective phenomena does it reflect and what are its social significance and class role in the contemporary world?

---

[1] W. W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth*, Cambridge, 1960, p. 108.

[2] See, for example, the typical view expressed by the Dean of Boston University, A. Knudson: "The philosophical apologetic for war has not as yet taken on a fixed form ... but these may be reduced to three main arguments: one based on the combative nature of man, a second on the dynamic nature of the state, and the third on the beneficent function of war. (A. C. Knudson, *The Philosophy of War and Peace*, New York, 1947, p. 20.)

There is undoubtedly some connection between wars and national sovereignty, so that these theories are based on an element of truth. In the history of the last few centuries there have been numerous examples of wars (including two devastating world wars) launched by *bourgeois national sovereign* states. But it is quite wrong to interpret this connection as a *causal* relationship. The concept of war as a social phenomenon is much wider than the concept of wars waged by national sovereign states. Wars occurred at earlier stages of development, under the slave-holding system and the feudal order, long before the establishment of nation states. Some of them were extremely ferocious and destructive, such as the wars between the great slave empires or the Crusades in the Middle Ages. We can find examples of all kinds of wars in history, differing greatly in their nature and social character: unjust, aggressive, expansionist wars, and just, progressive, emancipatory wars. All they had in common sociologically was that they all represented the continuation of the politics of a particular class. In every society where class antagonisms existed there were wars representing the continuation of the politics of the oppressor and exploiter classes, and wars that expressed the political aspirations of the oppressed, and which were essentially armed protest against oppression or aggression.

On the evidence of world history we can conclude that war is an essential feature of all socio-economic systems where class antagonisms exist, and that aggressive, expansionist wars have always been an expression of the property interests of the exploiter groups who wielded power, attempts by them to extend that power.

Attempts to present national sovereignty as a fundamental cause of war do not stand up to objective criticism in the light of historical facts, since national sovereignty is a later product of socio-historical development than war is.

Yet the opponents of national sovereignty often base their arguments not so much on historical as on present-day experience. In support of their demand for the abolition of national sovereignty they point to trends towards economic and political integration to be observed in the capitalist world today. Thus, D. B. Heater writes in his *Political Ideas in the Modern World:* "The world is shrinking.... The economic units are not nations, but sterling and dollar blocs and the economic federations of the European Common Market.... Most signifi-

cant of all, however, has been the measure of supranational agreement in Western Europe in NATO."[1]

Henry Owen, Chairman of the US State Department's Policy Planning Council, writes that "the modern industrial nation state is simply not adequate to the needs of the day",[2] by which he intends such organisations as international banks, the Common Market and so on.

The present trend towards economic integration is dictated by the needs of the productive forces at a high stage of development. Yet the ways in which these trends are manifested differ greatly depending upon their social content.

Modern international relations provide ample evidence to demonstrate that the international division of labour, developing on the basis of progressive social practice, leads to the establishment of mutually beneficial relations founded on complete equality that promote economic development and far from threatening, actually strengthen the national sovereignty of the countries concerned. On the other hand, the international division of labour developing on the basis of imperialism inevitably leads to increased exploitation, oppression and enslavement of the weaker nations by the stronger imperialist powers.

Two historical tendencies are inherent in capitalism as regards the national question. The first involves the awakening of national life and national movements and the creation of nation states, and the second is the destruction of national particularism and national identity as territories are brought closer together and united as a result of their increasing economic interdependence. The latter tendency is mainly characteristic of the imperialist stage of capitalism, and is particularly strong today, mainly due to the influence of the law of uneven development of capitalism at a time when the general sphere of capitalist exploitation is shrinking.

Supranational tendencies also reflect the political aspirations of the capitalists for unity in order to strengthen their positions vis-à-vis the main forces of the world revolutionary process—the socialist system, the working-class movement and the national liberation movement. This situation has led to an unprecedented development of the characteristic tendency of

---

[1] D. B. Heater, *Political Ideas in the Modern World*, London, 1964, p. 71.

[2] "Policy Premises for the Next Administration", *Foreign Affairs*, No. 4, 1968, p. 701.

imperialism to enslave not only agrarian countries but also highly developed industrial countries that have already achieved national statehood. The desire of the stronger capitalist countries to dominate weaker countries, including their partners, in order to dictate their will to them or at least bring considerable pressure to bear on their policies often takes the form of encouraging them to join various types of supranational organisation. This produces very sharp conflicts within the imperialist supranational federations and blocs. As Lenin noted long ago, underlying these conflicts is the deep ineradicable conflict of interests between imperialist countries. Lenin's words are confirmed by the fierce struggle going on today in imperialist circles in the field of economic rivalry, and over many international political issues, an excellent example being the dispute over the creation of a NATO multilateral nuclear force. All this tends to contradict the claims of the champions of integration that the imperialist countries could develop without conflict provided their sovereignty was limited.

The tendency to internationalisation invariably has a definite social content. Organisations like NATO or the Common Market have a definite imperialist character and infringe on the national sovereignty of other peoples: they actually represent the attempts of reactionary imperialist groups to impose their will on other peoples in their own selfish interests.

Thus, a negative attitude to national sovereignty in present-day conditions is essentially reactionary, whatever the political sympathies of those who hold such views.

The opponents of the principle of national sovereignty, including those who support the theory of "international anarchy", viewing it as the root cause of war, include people with very different political views, from conservative, neo-fascist and militarist to liberal and anti-militarist.

Let us take a look at the reasons for the wide range of political views held by advocates of this theory, and also at the content of the theory itself.

The reason why conservatives and reactionaries support the theory of international anarchy is above all to be sought in their class standpoint and the circumstances in which they have to act. Reactionary ideologists reject that all nations are equal and support aggressive imperialist "power politics". The principle of national sovereignty is incompatible with power politics since it declares interference in the internal affairs of

other countries unlawful, demanding respect for territorial inviolability and political independence, and insists that all nations, great or small, are equal.

The reactionary neo-fascist ideologists justify war and violence just as their predecessors did in the past. But since it is rather dangerous to repeat the old Nazi apologetics for aggression, they resort to the new method of combining propaganda of war with hypocritical phrases about the need to put an end to war. The theory that national sovereignty is the root cause of all wars suits their purposes perfectly. As a result, the apologists of militarism openly glorify war for world domination against sovereign states, slyly adding that such a war would put an end to war by putting an end to the principle of national sovereignty.

Such views find support in certain well-known theories from the political thought of the past which in their day reflected the political aims of the exploiter classes. Force and its increase are taken as inherent in the very nature of the state. Sovereignty is treated exclusively in terms of force, and war as its fatally inevitable consequence. This theory implies denial of the right of weak nations to exist.

Such views were most clearly stated by the English philosopher Hobbes (1588-1679), the reactionary German historian H. von Treitschke (1834-1896) and Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900). Indeed, Treitschke actually went as far as to say: "There is definitely something amusing in the existence of a small state[1]," and ". . .the use of force is the logical consequence of the nature of the state. The very existence of many states makes wars necessary[2]." These ideas are still propounded today, in a modern key, and as in the past express reactionary, aggressive aspirations.

Similar ideas are presented by the American neo-fascist ideologist C. Wickum. Basing himself on Treitschke with his cult of brute force, aggressive wars, chauvinism and racism, Wickum quotes his statement that "wars will occur as long as there are numerous states", interpreting it very differently, however. "If man has any method in his madness at all," he writes, "he should at least regard wars which emanate from a multiplicity of states as a means to *reduce* that multiplicity. This then is the essence of the new super-nationalism. If by this

[1] H. Von Treitschke, *Politik*, Leipzig, 1922, Band I, S. 34.
[2] Ibid., Band II, p. 592.

new kind of purposeful war we can finally get unity, then all the obliterations of national frontiers and sovereignties and even the temporary servitude of defeated nations to the victor nations is justified."[1]

Similar preaching of aggression is to be found in the proposals for the creation of a world state advanced by several advocates of modern cosmopolitanism. Thus, E. Reves wrote in his *The Anatomy of Peace*, a book which caused quite a sensation in the West at the time of its appearance: "If we cannot attain to universalism and create union by common consent and democratic methods as a result of rational thinking—then rather than retard the process, let us precipitate unification by conquest."[2]

Some opponents of national sovereignty do not deem it necessary to pretend sympathy with "democratic methods". Thus, the same C. Wickum makes no attempts to hide the undemocratic essence of his views, but openly brandishes the ideal of world domination, justifying war as a means of attaining it and criticising national sovereignty as an obstacle to its achievement. According to him, the idea of world government goes right back to the times of Confucius, Alexander the Great and the Roman Stoics, but "the practice of universal rule is only now becoming real and possible".[3] He sees the practical realisation of this ideal in the struggle for world power under the leadership of the United States.

Wickum has no qualms about glorifying war and violence in his propagation of the ideal of world government. He declares: "We must be prepared to understand that the means whereby a world state is accomplished will come as a matter of course and not as a matter of rose-coloured dreams.... Among these means are certain to be Force and Compulsion in the stead of discussion and economic persuasion."[4]

In the ideology of overt militarism and violence, the principle of national sovereignty, and indeed democratic principles in general, are naturally criticised, and the right of small states to exist is denied. Wickum cynically declares: "If democracy also means protecting the self-determination of every

---

[1] C. Wickum, *The Total State. A Philosophical Interpretation of Contemporary and Future Society*, Boston-Mass., 1964, pp. 73-74.

[2] Emery Reves, *The Anatomy of Peace*, New York-London, 1945, p. 269.

[3] C. Wickum, op. cit., p. 165.

[4] Ibid., p. 103.

geographical fly-speck that wishes to call itself a nation, then we should shun democracy like the plague."[1]

But what about the United Nations? What about international law? In Wickum's opinion, "there is no recognisable rule of law in international relations and it is a dream to think there ever could be".[2]

As for the UN, "today's United Nations is ... a guarantor of national sovereignty or pluralism.... It cannot be an instrument of world peace or world peace unity because as long as there are sovereign powers there will be wars."[3]

Thus, the only so-called "argument" on which Wickum bases his aggressive, militarist appeals for war for world domination is the fallacious thesis that national sovereignty inevitably leads to wars. The conclusion to be drawn from Wickum's neo-fascist statements is that national sovereignty is anathema to the imperialist reactionaries, as representing an obstacle to their expansion and their hopes of attaining world domination. At the same time, the theory that "national sovereignty leads to war" serves as a convenient mask for apologists of aggression, enabling them to put on a false front of concern for peace behind which to make their appeals for war. The role this thesis plays in the service of reaction is in this case perfectly plain to see.

Thus, condemnation of national sovereignty and attempts to discredit it lead straight to justification of war and militarism.

However, in the capitalist West condemnation of national sovereignty often goes hand in hand with the propagation of anti-militarist ideas and appeals for peace. It is often the case that liberal, and even progressive, anti-militarist scholars genuinely regard the abolition of national sovereignty and the creation of a world state as the only way to achieve peace.

The well-known American historian and expert in international affairs F. Schuman wrote in his *magnum opus* that the constant multiplication of independent sovereignties is aggravating international anarchy and is a cause of disorder and violence. He holds that the only way to ensure peace is the voluntary establishment of a World Federal Republic through agreement among governments and peoples.[4] This line of

[1] C. Wickum, op. cit., p. 114.

[2] Ibid., p. 150.

[3] Ibid., p. 114.

[4] Frederick L. Schuman, *International Politics. The Western State System and the World Community*, New York-Toronto-London, 1958, pp. 391, 678.

reasoning is common among bourgeois scholars. Ignoring the class causes of militarism and failing to recognise the fundamental antagonism between the two main existing socio-economic systems, they elaborate all sorts of utopian projects for the creation of a single, universal supranational government.

In actual fact, the adoption of any of these projects would involve the rejection of democratic principles both in the internal affairs of states and in international relations.

Let us examine some of the arguments used in defence of such views.

One of the first bourgeois liberal scholars to insist that national sovereignty is a fundamental cause of war was the British writer and publicist N. Angell, who entitled his major work on the problems of war and peace *The Great Illusion.*[1]

His abstract metaphysical approach to nationalism prevented Angell from perceiving the class nature of the forces wielding socio-economic power within the nation state. He was thus unable to make a concrete analysis of the question and produce a true explanation of the causes of war. Angell advocated supranationalism, the supranational ties of capital. He made the basic error of idealising international ties and accepting at its face value the myth that capital is essentially a peaceful factor. The outbreak of the First World War shortly after the appearance of his book served to underline his own "great illusion".

Angell, however, was undeterred, and continued to defend his theory. At a luncheon discussion held by the American Foreign Policy Association in New York in 1932, he once more maintained that "the fundamental cause of war ... the really fundamental cause is, I believe, international anarchy....

"It is just as impossible for anarchy to work effectively in the international field as it would be for anarchy to work within the state, for us to live at peace within the frontiers of the nation without the institutions of government, without law, without a Constitution, without courts."[2] The cause of international conflicts was "the separateness and independence of the national bodies".[3]

Angell predicted a future struggle between two trends: the

---

[1] N. Angell, *The Great Illusion*, London, 1911.

[2] N. Angell, "What Causes War? N. Y. Luncheon Discussion", *Foreign Policy Association*, Dec. 17, 1932, p. 10.

[3] Ibid., p. 12.

development of nationalism, producing international tension, hostility and armed conflict, and the conscious striving of "an enlightened minority" to create a world organisation capable of ensuring peace. These ideas of Angell's were approved of by liberal philosophers, sociologists, jurists and publicists, many of whom regarded cosmopolitanism as the only way to attain peace and rid the world of war.

This theory is propagated in various forms by a whole host of scholars, American, British, French, German and others.

However, it has been expressed most clearly by the American philosophers M. Adler and A. Freud.[1] Adler, Professor of Legal Philosophy at the University of Chicago, holds that in the interests of peace national sovereignty should not only be limited but completely abolished, and that the need to create a world government should be widely propagated without delay. In the foreword to Adler's book *How to Think About War and Peace*, Clifton Fadiman writes: "Something will *cause* world peace. It is world government. Something *causes* war. It is anarchy. Something *causes* world wars. It is world anarchy....

"Mr. Adler takes the bull by the horns. By the time we know what the bull's name is. The bull is called Sovereignty."[2] Adler himself declares: "The price of sovereignty is war."[3]

The chief failing of Adler's theory is that he completely ignores socio-economic factors and reduces all questions of war and peace to the problems of organisation of political life considered in the abstract. This is how he treats national sovereignty, reducing it to anarchy and self-will. "Anarchy," he writes, "is the condition of those who try to live together *without government*.... Anarchy and sovereignty are inseparable."[4]

A. Freud develops the same idea, maintaining that "war is the direct outcome of national sovereignty",[5] that "it is our political, anarchistic world system of national sovereignty"[6] that is responsible for it, and that "the national state is obsolete, anachronistic, and a drag on all humanity".[7] National

---

[1] M. Adler, *How to Think About War and Peace*, New York, 1944; A. Freud, *Of Human Sovereignty*, New York, 1964.

[2] M. Adler, op. cit., pp. XII-XIV.

[3] Ibid., p. 70.

[4] Ibid., p. 69.

[5] A. Freud, op. cit., p. 82.

[6] Ibid., p. 89.

[7] Ibid., p. 332.

sovereignty he defines as follows: "... national states, basing their claims on a mysterious 'national' background, have reserved the privilege of acting with no regard for any moral code. This privilege is called 'National Sovereignty' ".[1]

This way of presenting the matter involves a gross distortion of the concept of sovereignty. Not only is sovereignty irreducible to self-will and anarchy in international affairs but it actually serves to counter them. The principle of sovereignty implies the right to resist arbitrary acts since it is an organic element of the whole system of concepts that constitute international law.

As for the principle of *national* sovereignty, it is inseparable from democratic conceptions of social progress since it presupposes the absolute rights of a particular nation in all matters pertaining to its socio-economic and political structure. State sovereignty is complete freedom of the state from interference by other states in all matters concerning its internal affairs and external relations. Applied to all states, it implies respect for the inviolability and independence of any one of them, large or small. Sovereignty necessarily involves recognition of the equality of sovereign states, and respect for the sovereign rights of all nations.

Thus, we can see that sovereignty is not only perfectly compatible with organisation and order in international relations, but that recognition of sovereignty actually serves as the basis for international agreements, and is the basis of international law. The principle of sovereignty underlies those universally accepted principles of international law whose observance is an essential condition for co-operation between peoples and states.

The American professor, Charles Hyde, writes in his six-volume manual of international law that sovereignty is the basis of modern international law. "The growth of the law governing the relations between States has been characterised in practice by acceptance of the theory that the society of nations is comprised primarily of a number of so-called independent States, resembling each other in their acknowledgment of no obligation to recognise any common superior, and deemed accordingly to stand in law upon an equal footing. The basis of the law, that is to say, what has given to some principles of general applicability the quality and character of law, has been

[1] Ibid., p. 2.

the acquiescence of the several independent States which were to be governed thereby."[1]

This well-known principle of international law is being grossly flouted today by several imperialist powers, especially the USA, and the theory of "international anarchy" declaring national sovereignty to be the cause of war, is used to "justify" the aggressive policies of monopoly capital.

Another aspect of this theory that makes it scientifically untenable is its distorted treatment of social progress. Thus, Adler regards the development of human society solely as a process of quantitative growth, a process of continuous expansion involving the formation of ever larger political units.

On the basis of this false approach, Adler questions the right to existence of nation states, and criticises national sovereignty as putting the brakes on the process of political expansion, which he regards as inevitable. A world state is the natural limit of this expansion, the final stage of political growth in which two basic unities are combined: 1) world unity as the territorial basis for political life and 2) the unity of mankind, overcoming all racial or cultural differences as the psychological basis for world citizenship.[2]

Adler's argumentation reveals the same basic methodological flaw—the attempt to raise political categories to the quality of absolutes totally independent of socio-economic factors. He views the state in two dimensions only—the territorial and the biological—as an organisation uniting the whole human race. But the evolution of political forms cannot be considered without reference to the decisive factor of the socio-economic and class nature of a particular state.

Implicit in Adler's reasoning is the idea that the world state of which he speaks should be a socio-economic projection of the American state on a universal scale. Social inequality is taken as an inevitable feature of Adler's world state, a product of the functional needs of society. One of the functions he attributes to it being that of curbing the class struggle, it is essentially an organ of coercion.[3]

This view of the world state combined with the rejection of national sovereignty lends Adler's theory a basically reac-

---

[1] Charles Chency Hyde, *International Law Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States*, Boston, 1947, Vol. I, p. 4.

[2] M. Adler, op. cit., p. 69.

[3] Ibid., pp. 21, 30, 42, 190.

tionary character. It is directed against historical progress, the gradual development and perfection of society, a process which is inseparable from the creative activity of the masses.

Recognition of national sovereignty is an essential element of the scientific theory of progress. The concept arose as a reflection of the appearance of nations on the historical scene and served the interests of social progress insofar as it was directed against moribund feudalism. From the outset the principle of national sovereignty has been represented as an important democratic principle, being interpreted as the right of a nation to determine its own destiny. Thomas Jefferson, US President and an outstanding progressive of his age, wrote in support of the principle of popular sovereignty that "whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends [human rights.—*The Author*], it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organising its power in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness".[1]

Defined in the most general terms, national sovereignty is the principle that all nations have equal rights, the right to independence, national unity and self-determination up to and including the right to form an independent state, and also the right to freely determine their own economic, socio-political and cultural development.[2]

Today, in our age characterised by the transition from capitalism to socialism, the existence of a world socialist system and historic victories of the national liberation movement, the principle of national sovereignty does not merely retain its former progressive significance, but assumes new content that gives it a special relevance. It is called upon to safeguard the interests of the peoples of all countries, large and small, and implies recognition of the right of every nation to

---

[1] *The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Ed. by A. Koch and W. Peden, New York, 1944, p. 22.

[2] The principle of national sovereignty is similar to the concept of state sovereignty (where a nation has formed its own state), but care should be taken not to confuse the two, since state sovereignty existed prior to the formation of nations, while multinational states can also possess state sovereignty. State sovereignty is the complete independence of a state from interference on the part of other states in all matters concerning its internal affairs and foreign relations. The main content of national sovereignty is the right of every nation and people to decide its destiny.

freely choose its own path of socio-economic development, capitalist or non-capitalist.

Thus, the principle of national sovereignty is spearheaded against imperialist expansion, against all imperialist attempts to prevent peoples from becoming masters of their own destiny.

Why is it that the completely unfounded theory of "international anarchy" has come to interest so many intellectuals in the United States and Western Europe? Why is it that anti-militarist scholars and public figures in the capitalist West so often express views identical with, or very similar to those of Adler?

There are several reasons for this, the chief one being the gnosiological roots of the theory of "international anarchy". The theory has, as we have already seen, an objective basis in the aggressive, expansionist policy of the exploiter classes wielding power, today as in the past. Reactionary, undemocratic features of the routine policy of the imperialist countries (without going into the social essence of this policy) are easily associated with the national nature of the state, and national sovereignty in general.

Like Angell, Adler rejects biological and socio-psychological theories of the origins of war, quite rightly insisting that wars do not derive from human nature, but that the peace is the normal, natural condition, towards which man aspires. But the way of attaining peace recommended by Adler and other supporters of the theory of "international anarchy" runs contrary to the true interests of individuals and nations, since nothing is more damaging and prejudicial to the interests of social progress in our time than hostility to the principle of national sovereignty.

In their vain attempts to find arguments against national sovereignty, bourgeois ideologists speculate on the real features of the modern world, arbitrarily singling out certain links from the chain of contemporary events, interpreting them equally arbitrarily, and inventing patterns of social development that just do not exist.

Some positivist philosophers and sociologists (Ogburn, for example) see only the quantitative side of social processes and establish a direct causal link between the level of technological development (often reduced to speed of communications) and the area of "political units", i.e., state territory, making this the basis of their argument in favour of the abolition of national frontiers.

There is no denying that technology plays an extremely important role in social development. But technology is to be considered not in isolation, but as an organic part of the system of social relations, as part and parcel of the mode of social production as a whole. Nor is there any observable causal relationship between the speed of communications and the extent of a state's territory.

National frontiers *per se* cannot be said to hamper technological progress and the development of the productive forces. Thus, with socialism the productive forces are developing at unprecedented rates, despite the fact that the socialist system is a social, political and economic community of sovereign nations.

The international ties of capital are reactionary and based on exploitation, and national sovereignty is undoubtedly a hindrance to them. However, the struggle of peoples to free themselves from exploitation by monopolies, national and international, is definitely a progressive phenomenon. It is thus quite wrong to extol the supranational principle in the abstract and criticise national frameworks in general, without reference to specific cases. One must first determine the socio-economic nature of a given system of international ties and see whether they are based on equality and mutual advantage, whether they serve to promote the development and welfare of the particular nations concerned, whether they ensure aid and support for peoples whose economic progress has been retarded by the ravages of colonialism.

National liberation movements whose object is the attainment of national sovereignty promote above all the abolition of political oppression, one of the ugliest and most inhuman social features. However, social progress implies the liberation of society from all forms of oppression—economic, social and spiritual. The attainment of political independence and the collapse of the colonial empires create an important pre-condition for advance of the developing countries along the path of progress, involving deep-going socio-economic transformation.

The scientific concept of national sovereignty is based on the doctrine of the right of nations to self-determination. Any attempt to deny national sovereignty thus has an objectively undemocratic character.

There are some anti-militarist scholars and public figures who are opposed to national sovereignty and support the idea

of a world state and advance the thesis that absolute national sovereignty should be abolished.[1] But there is no such thing as absolute sovereignty. The existence of various international agreements and the obligations deriving from membership of the United Nations Organisation means that states voluntarily agree to certain general principles of conduct. This is the realistic way to go about the prevention of a new world war. Thus the draft agreement on general and complete disarmament submitted by the Soviet Union to the XV Session of the UN General Assembly for its consideration on September 23, 1960, contains no infringement on national or state sovereignty.[2]

In the modern world we witness a conflict between two diametrically opposed policies.

The first is directed towards the complete social and national emancipation of the peoples of the world. It corresponds to the natural direction of social progress and is most fully embodied in the Marxist-Leninist theory of social development. It is organically connected with democratic principles and the policy of peaceful coexistence and involves respect for both state and national sovereignty.

The second is directed against social and national emancipation, and runs directly counter to social progress. It reflects the interests of reactionary imperialist groups, whose aim is to oppose social progress with force, and is quite incompatible with the policy of peaceful coexistence.

The principle of peaceful coexistence provides the only rational basis for a foreign policy. Since prevention of a thermonuclear war is in the vital interests of all nations, peaceful coexistence is an objective necessity for the development of contemporary human society. The policy of peaceful coexistence combines the principles of international law, based on respect of state sovereignty in international relations, and recognition of the inalienable right of nations to self-determination and equality, embodied in the principle of national sovereignty.

It should be noted that the UN Charter itself is based on a combination of these principles. The concepts of state sovereignty and national sovereignty are both reflected in the Charter, which proceeds from the principle of sovereignty and non-

[1] See N. Cousins, *In Place of Folly*, New York, 1961, pp. 105-06.

[2] The Soviet disarmament plan will be discussed further on, in a separate chapter devoted to the subject.

interference of states in one another's internal affairs (i.e., recognises state sovereignty) and from the principle of equality and self-determination of peoples (i.e., recognises national sovereignty).

The Preamble to the UN Charter states that the peoples of the United Nations are determined "to reaffirm faith ... in the equal rights of nations large and small".

The principle of equal rights for all nations, large or small, is expressed in several articles of the Charter. Thus, Article 1 (2) prescribes UN members "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples". This is an affirmation of the principle of national sovereignty.

Article 2 (4) stipulates that "all Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state". This formula demands respect for the principle of state sovereignty in international relations.

If we look at the world today we can easily see that every hotbed of war around the globe is connected to a greater or lesser degree with direct violation or infringement of national sovereignty on the part of the imperialists. Progressives in all countries are clamouring for an end to these violations, and are demanding that all countries, and above all the United States, should henceforth adhere to the UN Charter and the principles of international law.

## Chapter VIII

# AGAINST JUSTIFICATION OF WAR BY MALTHUSIANISM AND GEOPOLITICS

Demographic theories are an important weapon in the bourgeois ideological arsenal. A good example is Malthusianism, propagated by the ruling classes right from the outset of organised opposition to capitalist exploitation, from the earliest days of the labour movement.

Malthus explained war and colonialism in terms of demographic processes. Racist theories, serving to stir up chauvinism and sanctify colonial oppression, are used as a means of combating the class ideology of the proletariat.

The general crisis of capitalism and the growing influence of the socialist countries and Marxist-Leninist theories in our age have led to the appearance of new, less overt demographic theories in the capitalist West. Biological conceptions have to a certain extent been replaced or supplemented by more subtle socio-psychological theories.

The well-known basic tenet of Malthusianism is the theory that mankind is heading for absolute overpopulation, that is, that population growth outpaces the growth of the means of subsistence. In *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, Malthus claimed that while food increases in an arithmetical ratio, population increases in a geometrical ratio.[1] According to him, it is the workers, through immoderate multiplication, who are responsible for the existence of such evil as unemployment and

[1] T. R. Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, Vol. I, Book I, London, 1826, p. 6.

poverty. He expressed the "hope" that each man from the "lower classes" who came to know his theory "would be disposed to bear the distresses in which he might be involved with more patience", "would feel less discontent and irritation at the government and the higher classes of society, on account of his poverty", "would be on all occasions less disposed to insubordination and turbulence".[1]

Today, Malthusianism is widely used to "justify" imperialist aggression. It played an important part in the events which led up to the Second World War, being advanced as an official doctrine of the Japanese imperialists, the Italian fascists and the nazis, all of whom tried to convince the working people that a nation should unanimously support the acquisition of *Lebensraum,* the lack of which was the cause of all their troubles. The nazis tried to justify their aggression by the theory of a "large economic territory", a theory which represented a mixture of racism, social-Darwinism, Malthusianism and geopolitics. "The state is a body, formed as a result of the instinct for survival of the species," Hitler wrote. "The healthy instinct of preservation of the species is expressed in the effort to ensure a correct balance between population and *Lebensraum.*"

The military defeat of nazism represented a serious blow to its "race theory". Nevertheless, many ideologists of German imperialism have continued to preach the same basic views in the post-war period. Referring to this, the demographic expert Otto Rühle (GDR) wrote: "Here we can clearly see the danger of the neo-Malthusian ideas that West Germany needs new *Lebensraum*" in the East. He points out that "since 1945 the number of ideologists of neo-Malthusianism has been growing yearly. Today, we can find neo-Malthusian ideas in West German school text-books. These views are becoming more and more widespread, serving as they do as an ideological 'justification' for the revanchist aspirations of the West German monopolies."[2]

In his book *Why—Where From—But Where To?,* the West German Malthusian and racist Hans Grimm, whose ideas were once a source of inspiration to Hitler, tries to justify Hitlerite aggression. He insists that only by taking into account the biological factors that drove Germany to war can "the history of

---

[1] Ibid., Vol. II, Book IV, p. 438.
[2] O. Rühle, *Brot für sechs Milliarden*, Berlin, 1963, S. 20.

Germany and Hitler as a historical phenomenon be properly understood".[1] He also maintains that if the Germans wish to ensure themselves a satisfactory way of life and avoid the threat of Bolshevism, the main problem they have to tackle is that of *Lebensraum.*

F. Fried, who preached racism and geopolitics under the nazis, is another who did not abandon his old course after the war, as can be seen from his *Changes in World Economy.*[2] Also published in West Germany in the late forties were *Land and Life* by K. Gebauer (Cologne, 1947), and *Universal Human Geography* by A. Gettener (Stuttgart, 1947), both of which propagated the ideas of *Lebensraum*, overpopulation and "the organic theory of the state". In *Universal Political Geography and Geopolitics* (1951), A. Haushofer[3] once more advanced the theory that in the human struggle for survival the victors will be those races that produce the most offspring, and that in this "struggle for survival" "the Aryan master race" should expand its *Lebensraum* at the expense of other peoples. Also in 1951, the journal *Geopolitik,* originally founded and edited by Karl Haushofer, resumed publication, and the West German geopoliticians returned to propagating their "theories" of *Lebensraum,* overpopulation and East-West conflict. The aim of all these theoretical concoctions was agitation for the remilitarisation of West Germany and the arming of the Bundeswehr, led by ex-Wehrmacht officers, with weapons of mass destruction and above all nuclear weapons.

However, so soon after a war which ended in defeat, the West German imperialists can hardly speak as openly about the need for *Lebensraum* as Hitler did. Openly aggressive Malthusian and racist theories would have been bound to cause alarm among the supporters of peace and progress in West Germany. Thus, in offering their services once again as a "shield" or "bulwark" against Bolshevism and communism, they prefer to cloak their designs in revanchist slogans like "reviewal of frontiers", the return of Germans to "the lost territories", and their "right to a homeland". They no longer express their expansionist aspirations in terms of the annihilation of the "inferior Slavs", but talk instead of the "integration" of Europe as

---

[1] Hans Grimm, *Warum—Woher—aber Wohin?*, Lippoldsberg, 1954, S. 206.

[2] F. Fried, *Wandlungen der Weltwirtschaft*, Stuttgart, 1948.

[3] A. Haushofer, son of Karl Haushofer, a leading nazi geopolitician, tried at Nuremberg.

far as the Urals, the "liberation" of the peoples of Eastern Europe from "communist slavery" and so on. The more intelligent bourgeois ideologists have recognised the need to take into account the lessons of the Second World War and the growth of opposition to fascism among a wide public both in the Federal Republic and throughout the world. Their attitude has been influenced to some extent by the fact that part of the West German bourgeoisie has shown dissatisfaction with the undisguised policy of revenge and a desire to lessen military and political dependence on the United States. Hence the need that arose in nationalist circles for other ways of pursuing their aggressive aims.

This has led several bourgeous ideologists to revise their theories somewhat. The aim was to "humanise" their ideas in order to make them more acceptable to the West German public at large. The essence of this "reinterpretation" of nazi theories is well revealed by the Marxist philosopher G. Heyden (GDR) in his *Critique of German Geopolitics. The Essence and Social Function of a Reactionary Sociological School.*[1]

Heyden examines the philosophical and scientific revision of nazi theories beginning with 1957 on the basis of an analysis of the journal *Geopolitik*. This "reinterpretation", which takes several directions, can be illustrated by a few examples, and especially by the articles of the journal's editor and leading theoretician, Rolf Hinder.

In contrast to the geopolitics of the 1920s and 1930s, which was mainly concerned with the "special structure of states" and with the establishing of the relationship between geography and politics, modern geopolitics, as Hinder writes, "devotes more attention to spacial changes caused by man", and "studies the space-changing strength of the human spirit and the inner relationship between politics and the conflict of social interests based on space".[2]

Here we can immediately note an attempt to widen the "field of investigation" by the addition of "spiritual forces". Whereas the principle of geographical determinism was formerly adhered to, today the geographical sphere is linked to the political by an "intermediate factor", i.e., man, his "spirit", psychology, etc.

---

[1] G. Heyden, *Kritik der deutschen Geopolitik. Wesen und soziale Funktion einer reaktionären soziologischen Schule*, Berlin, 1958.

[2] Rolf Hinder, "Vom Sinn der modernen Geopolitik" in *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik im Gemeinschaft und Politik*, N. 1, 1958, S. 35.

Attempts to give the impression of opposition to the old discredited theories are even to be found on the pages of the fascist magazine *Nation Europa*, to wit an article by A. Ehrhardt entitled "Biopolitics: Accomplishment of the Laws of Life".[1] Ehrhardt suggests that today's most complicated international problems can be resolved by "applying the findings of genetics to politics". Purporting to be attacking both imperialism and Bolshevism ("the dictatorship of the proletariat"), he writes: "In contrast to these plans of East and West, biopolitics serves the future of all mankind." Treating Marxist theory as a kind of biological doctrine, he criticises the "Marxist-Michurinist theory" that "a perfect human race" can be derived from a perfect social environment. He claims that the findings of genetics refute this theory, which he mistakenly regards as Marxist. According to him, it is inherited features, combinations of genes, that determine the environment, and not the other way round. Thus, the anti-Communist Ehrhardt tries by means of primitive biologising of social phenomena to present genetics as the answer to the most burning social and political issues.

These few examples of "corrections" made by West German theoreticians are far from exhausting the numerous devices employed in the "reinterpretation" of geopolitics.

On the whole the new trends to be observed in geopolitics represent a departure from the traditional theory of *Lebensraum*, and an attempt to suggest a clean break with such discredited theories as racism. While remaining nationalistic supporters of "the Great Germany", the new theorists aspire to the role of spokesmen for a new political awareness suited to the nuclear age. The widespread fear of nuclear war and of a possible solution of the German question by military means forces them to accept the idea of the peaceful solution of international conflict. As Hinder wrote, in the nuclear age war would mean "the destruction of all possibility of life". Geopolitics should attend to "the spacial factors of a strategy of peace for the world". Since war is no longer "a real possibility, but is rather a real impossibility", an enemy becomes an equal, an ally and even a "friend". Self-preservation of society consists "not in annihilation of alien society but in coexistence". Since the impossibility of coexistence still creates a basis for war, it

[1] A. Ehrhardt, "Biopolitik—Vollzug der Gesetze des Lebens" in *Nation Europa*, No. 12, Dec. 1964, S. 3-9.

is essential that we "banish all hostile feelings". Hinder considers "the policy of womanly softness and compliance" to be the "only realistic attitude today". He refers to the cold war in Freudist terms, as "survivals of the past" and the cultivation of "hate complexes".[1]

Similar views are expressed by G. Jentsch in an article in the same magazine. He also advances a theory of geopolitical cosmopolitanism and a socio-political programme based on the possibility of "rational coexistence of historical forces".[2] There are three stages to his programme for the "renewal" of the world. The first is "overcoming mental hostility" in order to "overcome world contradictions and transform them into a new harmonious system". This leads to the second, the establishment of a system whereby the earth's resources would be distributed and used "according to the biological laws of symbiosis". The third stage is a "perfect world Empire", "a perfected divine Empire of Christians" where all the dreams and hopes of all the peoples of the world will be brought to pass. R. Hilf views the society of the future in similar terms, maintaining that the world "is moving relentlessly towards a universal order of peoples and states", a "just order", combining "the Christian and the communist world-view". The above conceptions of the development of world events are clearly utopian with marked theological overtones.

Since the war Malthusian-racist and geopolitical ideas have been taken up and used by several American imperialist ideologists. A feature of the post-war works of the US Malthusians has been the importance attached to the issues of war and peace. Once more the ideologists of the most aggressive forces of monopoly capital began clamouring about "inexorable growth of population", population increase as a cause of war, about "the need for nations with a low birth rate to defend themselves from nations with a high birth rate" and so on. Numerous books appeared in the USA after the war preaching the most gloomy, negative ideas of Malthusianism, books like the *Road to Survival* by W. Vogt (New York, 1948), *Population Roads to War or Peace* by Burch and Pendell (New York, 1947), *The Conditions of Economic Progress* by C. Clark (New York, 1953) and a host of others. *The World's Hunger*

---

[1] *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* . . ., No. 1, 1958, S. 4.

[2] G. Jentsch. "Der Begriff des Politischen" in *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* . . ., Nr. 1, 1958, S. 32.

by Pearson and Harper (New York, 1945) presents the old Malthusian theory that population increases more rapidly than food supply and there will inevitably be wars unless population can be drastically reduced.

The famous American demographer W. Thompson put in a great deal of effort in an attempt to produce an ideological justification for war, trying to prove that the growth of population in the Pacific area represented a "threat" to the United States and the whole of Western civilisation.[1] In another book he writes: "The only sure relief for population pressure and the tensions and troubles it creates is population control ... the alternative to such control must be the return of a high death rate due to hunger and want and disease and probably *hot* war in the not distant future."[2]

Malthusian theories have influenced French sociology too. G. Bouthoul writes in his *A Hundred Million Corpses* that war is a natural periodic phenomenon, like animal migration, and is due to "overpopulation of the earth and a shortage of living space". He looks upon wars as useful in that they help "restore the upset social balance" by destroying "surplus" population. In another book he expresses the view that "a surplus of young people who are not indispensable to the principal economic tasks" creates "collective aggression".[3] Another French Malthusian, Paul Reboux, regards modern wars as biological events, and remarks that "the ferocity of wars is proportional to the surplus of human beings".[4]

Similar views are expressed by several British Malthusians. Thus, the former President of the American Association of Advancement of Science, Mr. Hill, declared that high population growth would lead to increasing international tension and disorder threatening the very existence of civilisation.[5] *The Daily Telegraph* wrote on June 28, 1947, that war was not such a bad thing after all, since it gets rid of crisis and unemployment and raises production.

Like the West German revanchists, the supporters of modern geopolitics in the NATO countries are trying to disassociate themselves from the fascist theories of population, cloaking the

---

[1] W. Thompson, *Population and Pecce in the Pacific*, Chicago, 1946.

[2] W. Thompson, *Population and Progress in the Far East*, Chicago, 1959, pp. 399, 400.

[3] G. Bouthoul, *La surpopulation dans le monde*, Paris, 1958, p. 184.

[4] Paul Reboux, *Trop d'enfants?*, Paris, 1951, p. 253 et seq.

[5] R. Innes, *Essays in Biography*, London, 1954, p. 26.

old Malthusian ideas in "truth", "humanism", "defence of peace", "philanthropy" and numerous other guises. The American journalist G. Seldes correctly observed in his book *One Thousand Americans*: "...Any fascist attempt to gain power in America would not use the exact Hitler pattern. It would work under the guise of 'super-patriotism' and 'super-Americanism'. Fascist leaders ... know that they must hand out a line that 'sells'."[1]

The strong movement for peace and the peaceful policy of the socialist countries force even the most reactionary ideologists of aggression to refrain from expressing their views openly and adopt a more subtle approach. In this respect the "evolution" of W. Vogt's ideas may serve as a good example. His misanthropical book *Road to Survival* (1948) was followed in 1952 by an article in which he declared that the increase in the earth's population represents a greater threat to peace than the atom bomb. In 1960, he published another book[2] in which he insisted that he was guided, as before, by his concern for the future of mankind and expressed his regret that his former book had been misunderstood and branded as fascist. He then proceeded to advance the same Malthusian views as before, but taking care to do so in a more cautious manner. Referring to demographic statistics, he draws a very gloomy picture of the contemporary world on the brink of catastrophe. The growth in the population, he wrote, "has taken on the sinister shape of the nuclear blast's mushrooming cloud".[3] He draws another equally graphic comparison, this time between world population growth and the growth of a cancer cell.[4] Vogt laments the fact that there have never been so many people dissatisfied with their lives as there are today. People eke out a wretched existence, suffering from lack of employment in the literal and in the more general sense. The reason for this sorry state of affairs, according to Vogt, is excessive population growth, making us vulnerable in a number of ways Malthus could never have conceived.[5] Disaster is brought nearer by a fanatical cult of economic growth, a policy of state and public social welfare, unemployment benefit, child allowances, free education and health services, and so on and so forth. Despite the vast sums

[1] George Seldes, *One Thousand Americans*, New York, 1947, p. 103.
[2] W. Vogt, *People! Challenge to Survival*, New York, 1960.
[3] Ibid., p. 43.
[4] Ibid., p. 47.
[5] Ibid., p. 66.

spent on various forms of "aid", this great sea of starvation and malnutrition continues to exist.[1] Like other neo-Malthusians, Vogt devotes a great deal of attention to the less developed countries, and would have us believe that it is overpopulation that is responsible for their poverty and backwardness, and that this represents a serious threat to the developed countries. Vogt refers to the suggestion he made twelve years before in *Road to Survival* that aid should only be accorded to those less developed countries that were sponsoring birth control, and tries to explain that his proposals were dictated by genuine humanitarian concern. He suggests that instead of sending armies of technicians and engineers to these countries, and paying out billions of dollars on their industrialisation, it would be far more sensible to send birth-control pills.[2] Only those who agree to accept birth control should be helped. However, afraid this might sound just a little too callous, he adds that he is by no means suggesting that birth control is the only answer to the problem of overpopulation. All sorts of other measures are necessary, such as the improvement of agricultural techniques, the soil, water, meadows and forests, industrialisation, education, capital investment and technical aid. Yet he nevertheless insists on a reduction of the birth rate as a panacea for all the world's economic and social problems. All the time, in a careful effort to avoid the accusation that he is being too misanthropic, he cloaks his gloomy Malthusian ideas in heavily sugared protestations of concern for "the welfare of mankind". This, however, does not serve to make them any more scientific.

Unfortunately, the task of the ideologists of aggression is lightened by the incorrect method of analysis of the demographic processes employed by several outstanding bourgeois scientists. The latter include the supporters of the theory of "demographic cycles" and "demographic stages", according to which all nations pass through three stages in their development: the stages of potential growth, transitional growth and gradual decline. The first stage of extremely slow population growth is followed by a veritable population "explosion", which in turn is followed by virtual stabilisation but at what is considered an excessively high density. This theory was advanced by the American geographer P. James in his *A Geography of*

[1] W. Vogt, op. cit., p. 84.
[2] Ibid., p. 146.

*Man* (New York, 1949). Some of those who support such theories hold that countries at the second and third stages have an excessively high population causing "demographic pressure". This, they hold, is what moves them to undertake aggressive wars for the acquisition of living space. Some treat society as a biological organism, others approach the dynamics of the demographic processes in the abstract, without relating them to modes of production. In point of fact, however, the dynamics of demographic processes can only be successfully analysed in the context of a given set of socio-economic conditions.

After the Second World War a new situation arose in view of the sharp uptrend in population growth resulting from a decline in the mortality rate in the countries that had freed themselves from colonial rule. At the turn of the century the world's population was about 1,600 million; in 1964 it was 3,260 million, or more than doubled, and according to UN estimates it is expected to almost double again by the year 2000.

Population growth has indeed become a serious problem, especially in the case of the developing countries. Hence the increasing influence of Malthusianism on scholars and scientists who fail to adopt a scientific approach to the complex relationship and interaction between socio-economic and demographic factors, and are dismayed by such rapid growth.

The American sociologist Philip Hauser writes in his *Population Perspectives*[1] of "a demographic revolution" and the possibility of a global crisis, since "the globe is finite" and "living space would be exhausted". He thinks that if the developing countries fail to achieve a higher standard of living, we must expect aggression from large hungry countries as a result of population pressure. Similar views are to be found in *The Population Dilemma* (New York, 1963), *Population Problems in the Future* (Minneapolis, 1958), *Overpopulation—The Twentieth Century Nemesis* by A. Stuart (New York, 1958), and numerous other books and articles.

There are many scholars who support peace, yet who regard the "population explosion" as a major obstacle to the peaceful solution of international problems. A good example is the famous British historian and sociologist Arnold Toynbee, who expressed his ideas on the subject in his address "Man and

---

[1] P. Hauser, *Population Perspectives*, New Brunswick-New Jersey, 1960, p. 8.

Hunger: The Perspective of History" to the World Food Congress in 1963.[1] From time immemorial man has suffered from three great evils: war, disease (epidemics) and hunger. These three natural scourges all have the effect of keeping numbers down to within certain limits. However, man has escaped from complete dependence on nature and is able to embark on a more humane path for fulfilling the aims of nature. He can only be successful on one condition—that of regulating the birth rate. Our earth has finite dimensions so that if war and epidemics are eliminated it is essential that population growth be limited correspondingly. Moreover, a high unregulated birth rate is the most difficult challenge modern man must respond to, more difficult than the challenge to abolish war. Although war is caused by the imperfection of human nature as of other animals, "war could perhaps be abolished effectively by agreement among the small minority of the human race that has a monopoly of political power".

Reducing the birth rate, on the other hand, is more difficult in Toynbee's opinion, because it involves the behaviour of millions of couples with their personal family relations, traditions and prejudices. The danger of rapid population growth and the (according to Toynbee) resulting hunger in the developing countries has been greatly increased by the appearance of the atomic weapon, which has brought "race suicide" within sight of becoming feasible. The two main tasks today are: the political task of getting the whole human race to administer itself as a single world-wide unit for the purpose of producing and distributing food, and the task of regulating the birth rate to match the already achieved reduction of the death rate.

Bertrand Russell writes in his article "Population Pressure and War" that the world at the present day is faced with two antithetical dangers. The first is the risk that nuclear war might destroy the human race, and the second, not nearly so widely appreciated, is that the human population of our planet may increase to the point where the threat of universal destitution through overpopulation might easily lead to a nuclear war.[2] He considers that a reduction in the birth rate promises rapid progress, the elimination of poverty and the creation of

---

[1] *Population Bulletin*, Population Reference Bureau, Inc., Washington, Dec. 1963, Vol. XIX, No. 8, pp. 218-24.

[2] World Academy of Art and Science. *The Population Crisis and the Use of World Resources*, Ed. by Stuart Mudd, The Hague, 1964, p. 1.

a harmonious fellowship of nations, and the population problem is thus the most important.

As we have seen, considerable nuances are to be found in Malthusian literature. Side by side with the diehard ideologists of imperialism we find well-meaning scholars who have simply failed to grasp the complex relationships between demographic, social and political factors, who are sincerely dismayed at the rapid growth of population and consider it an important determinant factor for the future of mankind. The liberal Malthusians sincerely believe that the struggle to reduce the birth rate is an important means of removing the threat of war. There are many attempts to present the modern age as the "age of the demographic revolution", in which mankind is threatened by two grave dangers, the Bomb and Overpopulation. Some even go as far as to say that the great danger is "not the nuclear explosion but the population explosion". Whatever their subjective aims, however, such people are in fact supporting the Malthusian cause of diverting the attention of the masses from the most vital social, economic and political issues of our time—the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism—to the problem of population. Yet the fact remains that without a clear understanding of the socio-economic, class origins of war, and unless the social forces capable of abolishing them are revealed, all efforts to condemn war are futile.

Marxism rejects the idea that the causes of war are to be sought in human nature or demographic processes. Marxism-Leninism regards wars as the continuation of politics by violent means. Thus, Lenin wrote: "*All* wars are inseparable from the political systems that engender them."[1] In order to define the true nature of a war, it is necessary to reveal its class essence, see which class is waging the given war. The aim of Malthusianism, geopolitics and other such false doctrines is to conceal it. Yet only by first discovering the causes of wars can we hope to find ways of abolishing them and establishing peace. Such is the attitude of many progressive scholars.

Thus, the German scholar W. Hollitscher, in his article "On the Supposed Overpopulation of the World" published in *Wissenschaft und Fortschritt* (GDR), wrote of Vogt's Malthusian "theories": "It is perfectly understandable that the spokesmen for this doomed socio-economic system should try to divert

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 400.

mankind's attention from the real causes of the poverty that imperialism brings the world. This is why these scholars attribute all evils in the world to supposed "overpopulation", insisting that overpopulation makes a struggle for *Lebensraum,* and thus wars, inevitable. . . ."[1]

The French scholar Jean Gaudebert writes in his article "Neo-Malthusianism, the Instrument of War and Social Reaction of Decaying Capitalism", that the neo-Malthusians intend to cast the blame for a third world war, especially if it should originate in Asia, on overpopulation, and thereby attempt to demoralise and demobilise the peoples struggling for peace.[2]

As early as November 1948, the journal *Political Affairs* criticised the "resurrection" and dissemination of reactionary Malthusian ideas. The journal pointed out that neo-Malthusianism had become one of the weapons in the ideological arsenal of imperialism, and that it was therefore essential to reveal on the basis of concrete material the unscientific nature of these ideas and the reactionary character of the political deductions drawn from them. Life refuted Malthusianism, both on the demographic count (the proposition that population increases in a geometrical ratio) and on the economic (the claim that the means of subsistence increase at a lower rate than population).

By the turn of the century, population growth had dropped off considerably in the advanced capitalist countries and by the time of the Great Depression (1929 to 1933) the leading capitalist countries (France, Germany, Britain and the USA) were threatened with a population decrease, while the growth of the means of subsistence had easily outstripped the rate of population increase. It was then that "Malthusianism turned inside out" (Hersch) made its appearance, an attempt to attribute poverty and unemployment to a low birth rate and not a high one, while Hitler strove to promote aggression on the grounds that the birth rate in Germany had fallen off due to lack of *Lebensraum.*

It should have been quite obvious that this sharp decline in the birth rate was due to capitalist class contradictions, for the birth rate dropped quite as much in France and Britain with their vast colonial territories as it did in Germany.[3] Moreover,

[1] "Über die angebliche Übervölkerung der Erde", *Wissenschaft und Fortschritt,* N. 3, 1952, S. 65.

[2] *Cahiers du communisme,* Mai 1952, p. 506.

[3] The causes were industrialisation and urbanisation, and the fact

today the aggressor is not India, with a high density of population (110 inhabitants per sq. km.) or Egypt with its high rate of increase (2.5 per cent), but the United States, with a low density (20.5 per sq. km.) and a low increase (1.5 per cent).[1]

The modern Malthusians attach a great deal of significance to high rates of population increase in the developing countries. There are numerous factors contributing to this, just as there were in Europe during the 18th and 19th centuries: complete absence of family planning, the persistence of the household economy, child labour, early marriage, high infant mortality, illiteracy, and tradition and religion sanctifying large families and preventing a more rational approach to motherhood and family planning. Modern advances in medicine have led to a sharp reduction in the death rate and must thus be counted as another factor contributing to higher population increase. Such large increase brings additional difficulties when it comes to tackling the task of freeing the economy from outside control and raising living standards. Marxists are thus all in favour of an active policy of birth control out of considerations of simple humanity. What they are opposed to is the attempt to use Malthusian and other reactionary bourgeois theories in an open or heavily camouflaged form for the purpose of diverting attention from the real causes of poverty and want, thereby obstructing the struggle against colonial aggression and neo-colonialism. Marxists hold that the real answer to the problems of the developing countries is for them to be freed from their economic dependence on the imperialist powers.[2] The solution for the developing countries is to adopt

---

that more and more women were going out to work, abandoning their traditional role of housewife and mother which had given them the time to bring up large families. Another reason for such a drastic reduction, almost to the point of depopulation, was insecurity and unemployment, particularly in the period of the Great Depression (1929-33).

[1] K. Witthauer, *Bevölkerung der Erde*, Gotha, 1958, S. 105, 276-77.

[2] Analysis of the facts shows that "aid" being offered by the capitalist countries at present by no means always helps strengthen the economy of the developing countries, since the profits derived from it by the monopolies of the imperialist countries are often in excess of the amount invested, so that new investment is often largely reinvestment of the profits already made. Economic assistance is frequently offered in the form of military aid. The increasing losses borne by the agricultural and raw material producers on the world market are generally greater than aid received from the Western powers.

the non-capitalist path of industrialisation, improving the efficiency of agriculture, abolishing child labour, raising the welfare and educational standards of the masses, improving the health system and overcoming the prejudices concerning the size of families, birth control and so on. In other words, Marxists and Communists are not against birth control and family planning, but against neo-Malthusianism, which reduces all social problems to the problem of population and considers the biological development of mankind to be the chief motive force of history.

In contrast to the pessimistic Malthusian forecasts, many scientists and scholars have produced convincing evidence to show that at the modern level of scientific achievement our earth could support a far larger population than it does at present and ensure them a high standard of living, were it not for the negative influence of capitalist production relations.

It is interesting to note what the former director of FAO (the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation), J. Boyd-Orr, has to say in this connection: "Modern science has the answer to Malthus. . . .food production has never been geared up to full speed. The target in Western civilisation has been, not the amount needed to supply human needs, but the amount that could be sold at a profit."[1]

The one-time leader of the World Peace Movement, John Bernal, states in his famous book *World Without War* that at present only 13,200,000 sq. km. of land, or 10 per cent of the world's land surface, are being used for agriculture, whereas the area suitable for agricultural purposes amounts to 93,900,000 sq. km. or some seven times that area. Bernal holds that science offers practically unlimited prospects of improving agricultural techniques and increasing food output.

The Danish scientist A. Jakobson announced at the Agrarian Economists Conference in Helsinki in 1955 that he had calculated that harvests as high as those gathered in Denmark or other West European countries from an area of 3,600 million hectares would be enough to feed a population of 32,000 million. If we consider that apart from increasing harvests it is also possible to greatly extend the area under cultivation,

[1] J. Boyd-Orr, *The White Man's Dilemma. Food and the Future*, London, 1953, p. 80.

it would appear that man has indeed practically unlimited prospects for increasing food output, without mentioning the wealth of the seas and oceans.

In contrast to the Malthusians, Marxists are optimistic as regards demographic prospects too. What are the demographic trends to be observed in the socialist countries, and what is the outlook for their development under communism?

If we take into account, as we must, the complexity of the factors influencing these trends, and the fact that some of them —poorly developed productive forces, existing family relations and everyday habits, wars and their consequences—continue to exert an influence for a considerable time after a revolution, it is plain that the trends of population growth cannot be changed as quickly as production relations.

If we take the Soviet Union as an example of population trends in socialist society, we can observe the following characteristic features: a rapid decline in overall and infant mortality as a result of improved welfare and a state health system making qualified medical attention available to all sections of the population, and the disappearance of social distinctions in the birth and death rates; this is accompanied by a drop in the birth rate, due to numerous factors, the chief of which are a sharp decline in child mortality, better family planning as a result of higher educational standards, all helped by rapid industrialisation and urbanisation involving large-scale migration, the equal participation of women in education, economic and public life, a widening of the gap, despite the fast rates of building, between housing construction and the actual new requirements, and changes in the age structure of the population and the sex ratio as a result of the war. There are other factors, however, working in the opposite direction, such as the absence of unemployment, confidence in the future that comes with social security, the vast increase in public services and child welfare services (including crèches, kindergartens, etc.) and rapidly improving living conditions.

As for the future prospects, in communist society where all people's needs are satisfied (on the basis of the principle "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs") the economic factors that tend to reduce the birth rate will no longer apply.

Communism presupposes an extremely high future growth of the productive forces. At the same time, Engels' prediction that people will "make their history conscientiously" will ap-

ply to population growth: with the attainment of complete harmony between the individual and society, the population growth rate will fully correspond to the interests of both the individual family and society. Thus, communist society will face neither the threat of overpopulation (as the Malthusians fear) nor the threat of depopulation (as feared by the supporters of the "welfare theory").

To conclude, the socio-political trends to be observed in the modern world—and that includes demographic trends—do not confirm the neo-Malthusian theories that population growth is a major cause of wars and the chief threat of a new world war.

## Chapter IX

# WESTERN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY ON THE CAUSES OF WARS AND THE MEANS OF AVERTING THEM

There has been a growing interest in the West over the last few decades in the socio-psychological aspects of war and peace. Although there had been earlier attempts to find the psychological origins of conflicts and the means of eliminating them, it was only after the war that the range of investigations conducted in this sphere was greatly widened to include such a plurality of different problems as national character, individual character, the influence of social and other conditions, and psychological distortion of reality, to mention but a few.

Marxists show a keen interest in the study of the psychological aspects of war and peace. With regard to the work carried on by Western scholars in this field, they are guided by the principle of careful selection of valuable, realistic propositions, and energetic criticism of theories that obscure the essence of the problems, and either directly or indirectly help spread the idea that war is inevitable.

## Basic Trends in Western Social Psychology and Their Treatment of the Problem of the Origins of War

There are two basic trends in modern Western social psychology, the psycho-analytic and the behaviourist, differing in their origin, methods of investigation and main theories.

The psycho-analytic trend, which still commands widespread support, albeit far less than in the thirties, derives from the theories of the founder of psycho-analysis, Sigmund Freud (1856-1939). Although Freud never actually set himself the specific aim of investigating the causes of war, he considered his theories to be universally valid, applicable to the solution of the most diverse social phenomena, international conflicts included. Freud explained aggressive behaviour by the hypothesis of the existence of a supply of unconscious aggressive energy in man. In peacetime numerous social taboos are imposed on this drive, but in wartime the position is reversed and there is plenty of opportunity for the drive to discharge its energy. To begin with, Freud was inclined to believe that aggressive behaviour is produced by a state of crisis resulting from the disappointment of plans and hopes (frustration), but later he abandoned this view for the theory of a built-in aggressive instinct.

The First World War bringing violence and destruction on a colossal scale moved Freud to develop further his theory of an innate aggressive drive: he postulated an innate drive for death and destruction (Thanatos) in constant conflict with its opposite, the drive of life and its procreation and preservation (Eros). He came to regard this innate death drive as the one and only cause of wars: if a nation is not at war and has no suitable substitutes for war, the pent-up death instinct, finding no outlet, will bring about the destruction of that nation.

The deduction that automatically follows from this fatalistic theory is that wars are a natural phenomenon, deriving from human nature and therefore unavoidable. Despite the fact that Freud himself wanted to be a pacifist, and indeed considered himself as such, his fatalistic theory forced him to adopt a far from pacifist attitude to war. He declared that war "seems quite a natural thing, no doubt it has a good biological basis and in practice it is scarcely avoidable".[1]

Freud's theory was severely criticised from the start by progressive scholars and even by several Right-wing philosophers and psychologists. The highly reactionary political character of Freudism and its metaphysical methodology supposing the existence of immutable unconscious drives in man, the primitive structure of the theory based on two major instincts, and the strong element of fatalism caused even its followers to

[1] Quoted from Harry K. Wells, *Pavlov and Freud*, New York, 1960, p. 34.

adopt a critical approach, introducing certain alterations and rejecting several of its propositions.

Today, psycho-analysis no longer represents a single system but has forked out along various paths. One group of psycho-analysts—Nunberg, Strachey, Waelder, and others—accepts Freud's theory of the "death instinct" or the "aggressive instinct"; another, the most influential—Saul, McNeil, Berkowitz, et. al.—has developed the theory that aggression is the product of frustration, individual or social. Saul declares that "hostility is a disease of development and has its chief sources within the personality".[1] While Dollard and his colleagues, in their book *Frustration and Aggression* (1939) held that frustration invariably results in aggression, McNeil supports the rather different view that "the bulk of human aggressiveness can be traced directly to frustration",[2] but that frustration, individual or social, does not necessarily produce aggressive response.

The supporters of the theory of frustration are generally sharply critical of the Freudian concept of a built-in instinct of aggression. Berkowitz, for instance, claims that "very few psycho-analysts today accept Freud's hypothesis of a death instinct", since "... the concept of an innate drive for destruction, as Freud has posited it, is scientifically unwarranted".[3] Berkowitz, like many other psychologists, could not fail to observe the marked reactionary nature of the basic Freudian propositions.

The supporters of the theory of frustration ascribe the cause of war not to an innate aggressive instinct but to social frustration, i.e., social psychology in a state of crisis as a result of the frustration of national plans, hopes and aspirations. Sometimes the source of this frustration may lie within a given country. As McNeil puts it: "Since so many of our working and social relationships are organised in terms of employers and employees and leaders and followers, frustration can issue directly from unsatisfactory leadership which thwarts gratification of the needs of others."[4]

---

[1] See A. H. Buss, *The Psychology of Aggression*, New York-London, 1961, p. 190.

[2] E. B. McNeil, "Psychology and Aggression", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1959, Vol. III, No. 3, p. 202.

[3] L. Berkowitz, *Aggression. A Social-Psychological Analysis*, New York, 1962, p. 8.

[4] E. B. McNeil, op. cit., p. 203.

A similar view is held by the psycho-analyst J. C. Flugel, who considers that a country where the essential needs of the population are reasonably satisfied is less liable to go to war than a country whose inhabitants suffer serious discontent or irritation. "In the latter case," he writes, "the people feel that they have little or nothing to lose by going to war, and will welcome the relief afforded by the opportunity of expressing their aggression against a foe who can be made the scapegoat responsible for all their ills."[1]

Sometimes the source of social frustration may lie outside the country in question. Etzioni notes that "the more frustrations Americans suffer on the international front or in space competition, the more aggressive their mood becomes.... In fact, as the international situation continues to deteriorate ... the public becomes more and more aggressive and the pacifist program becomes less and less adequate."[2]

The above few examples should suffice to show how the supporters of the theory of frustration adopt an idealist as opposed to a materialist approach to investigation of the causes of war—proceeding from changes in social psychology to changes in objective reality. They regard a state of psychological crisis as the chief direct cause of aggressive behaviour, despite the fact that many of them admit that frustration is produced by outside circumstances. Thus, they are really making human psychology the chief cause of war,[3] which is actually the basic premise of the concept of an "aggressive instinct".

Another methodological weakness of the frustration theory, which is connected with the first, is its inability to explain aggressiveness in the absence of visible frustration. If Flugel's proposition that aggressiveness is the result of frustrated needs were correct, a country like the United States which enjoys the highest standard of living in the capitalist world ought surely to be one of the most peace-loving of all nations. In practice, however, we find that the opposite is the case. The

---

[1] J. C. Flugel, "Some Neglected Aspects of World Integration", *Psychological Factors of Peace and War*, Ed. by T. H. Pear, London-New York, 1950, pp. 129-30.

[2] A. Etzioni, *The Hard Way to Peace. A New Strategy*, New York, 1962, pp. 77, 78.

[3] Thus, the psycho-analyst R. Stagner writes: "Dictatorship and war are made possible by emotional infantilism on the part of both leaders and followers...." (R. Stagner, *Psychology of Personality*, New York, 1961, p. 525).

USA is today one of the most aggressive states in the world, the international gendarme of freedom-loving peoples.

Many of the critics of the theory of frustration quite rightly point out that the most bellicose states in history were not particularly poor, but, indeed, on the contrary, were usually among the most prosperous.[1] On the other hand, we cannot agree with those critics who insist that there is no connection at all between frustration and aggressive behaviour.[2]

Another important methodological flaw in the theory of frustration is that it fails to distinguish between the frustrations experienced by vastly differing groups in capitalist society, as for example the workers and the monopolists. In other words it puts into the same category the "aggressiveness" of the average man in the street and the aggressiveness of the ruling classes and closely allied imperialist military clique.

Despite the shortcomings we have mentioned, it would be a mistake to ignore the several sensible ideas supporters of the theory have advanced or helped propagate. One of the most constructive of these is the theory that popular indignation may be aroused by actions of bourgeois leaders who fail to satisfy the needs of the people, and that this discontent may be directed by the latter towards an illusory enemy, as Hitler did by making the Communists and the Jews the scapegoats for all Germany's troubles. Another is the theory that the hostility of a section of the population in capitalist countries towards national minorities like the Negroes, the Jews, etc., may be based on unfavourable economic factors producing frustration and resultant aggressive attitudes and behaviour.

A third psycho-analytic school (Fromm, Adorno, Else-Frenkel-Brunswick) is concerned mainly with describing the subconscious or "prejudiced" features of the personality of the contemporary individual. For Fromm, modern man is an "authoritarian personality", i.e., a personality aspiring to power, combining sadism (the desire to inflict pain) and masochism (the desire to receive pain).

For Adorno and his colleagues,[3] "the authoritarian personality" is synonymous with the "potentially fascistic individual", who when the favourable social conditions present themselves,

[1] See, for instance, G. Watson. *Social Psychology. Issues and Insights*, New York-Philadelphia, 1965, p. 502.

[2] See A. H. Buss, op. cit., p. 20.

[3] T. W. Adorno and others, *The Authoritarian Personality*, New York, 1950.

that is, when powerful economic forces wish to use anti-democratic propaganda to achieve domination, is capable of actively supporting the Napoleonic plans of his leaders. Buss gives a description of the "authoritarian man" as he is seen by the social psychologists. "The authoritarian divides others into two classes, the strong and the weak. He has a strict, rigid conscience and maintains that something is either good or bad, right or wrong, with nothing in between. He is afraid of being weak and must prove to himself that he is strong by aggressing against those who cannot retaliate."[1]

The "authoritarian personality" is a type who is frequently to be met in Western capitalist countries and indeed carries a threat to bourgeois democracy and international peace. But it is a great mistake to represent him as one of the chief potential causes of modern wars, or as typical of contemporary society as a whole.

A fourth psycho-analytic school is formed by the social psychologists, who are mainly concerned with examining the connection between child and adult psychology (A. Kardiner, M. Mead). Their main thesis is that differences between individual or group psychology (aggressive or non-aggressive) are determined by educational methods and the relationships between parents and children. They conduct experiments with school children, investigating, for example, such problems as the influence on the child's psychology of a "democratic" teacher, i.e., a teacher who uses persuasion, and an "authoritarian" teacher, who resorts to bullying, shouting, scolding and other forms of compulsion. A number of experiments have shown that the pupils of the latter kind of teacher are inclined to revolt and generally less constructive behaviour.[2] The child psychologists attempt to apply the results of their experiments and other observations from study of educational methods to society as a whole.

The main weakness of this approach is that it exaggerates the influence of education on the behaviour of adults. Educational methods doubtless play considerable role in forming the social psychology of large groups of people, but the ideological tendencies of teaching, whether propaganda of militarism or peace predominates, depend chiefly on the underlying economic and political tendencies of a given society, in short, on the social system.

---

[1] A. H. Buss, op. cit., p. 262.
[2] E. B. McNeil, op. cit., p. 269.

Moreover, as the sociologist H. Jones points out, the introduction of teaching methods designed to avoid provoking aggressiveness in children does not remove all the sources of social aggressiveness since "aggressive responses may be no less effectively mobilised even in adult life, by severe frustrations in current experience.... A wave of national aggressiveness due even to transitory frustrations (perhaps arising from the nation's position in the world) can be very violent...."[1]

The various schools of psycho-analysis outlined above, although differing somewhat in their basic points of departure, have enough in common to merit being considered as representing a single school of thought. In many cases both the problems they treat and the solutions they offer coincide.

Behaviourism, founded by J. B. Watson, developed in the twenties as a rival movement to the psycho-analytic trend in social psychology. In contrast to the latter, which postulated the existence of active or potential unconscious drives in people, behaviourism regards human perception as a combination of conditioned reflexes and behaviour as the sum of assimilated reactions to environment. Mental psychological activity is reduced to habits and behaviour patterns developed through study and practice.

In place of the "aggressive instinct" the behaviourists advance the concept of "aggressive habits". As A. Buss puts it, "in this behavioral approach to aggressiveness a crucial role is played by *habit*: aggressiveness is the habit of attacking".[2] T. Lentz declares: "The barriers [to international co-operation.—*Y. K.*] are in our heads and hearts. They are in our habits of social behaviour."[3]

How does an "aggressive habit" emerge? If we accept that the individual himself creates his habits we come back to the psycho-analyst postulation of unconscious active drives. The behaviourists therefore seek the answer in the behaviour of the group, and maintain that the causes of individual habits are to be found in the aggressive habits and traditions of the latter. According to Buss, "society specifies the targets, the amount and the modes of aggression; those who do not conform are maladjusted".[4]

[1] H. Jones, *Human Relationships and Group Behaviour. Alternatives to War and Violence—A Search*, London, 1963, p. 21.

[2] A. H. Buss, op. cit., p. 198.

[3] T. E. Lentz, *Towards a Science of Peace. Turning Point in Human Destiny*, New York-London, 1955, p. 22.

[4] A. H. Buss, op. cit., p. 207.

However, in transferring the source of aggressiveness from the individual to society, the behaviourists really do no more than state the plain fact of the existence of aggressive habits, without solving the problem of their origin.

In their attempts to find the origins of social aggressiveness psychologists of various trends and schools frequently resort to the theory of "culture-patterns" advanced by Ruth Benedict in 1934. According to this theory, warfare is a "social theme that may or may not be used in any culture".[1] T. H. Pear, a supporter of this theory, sees the culture-pattern as "the general principle of integration by means of which the customs, institutions and dogmas, the sentiments, interests and values of a culture are woven into a more or less coherent 'pattern' ".[2] The method of ascribing aggressiveness to certain cultures does not account for the question of the causes of hostile relationships with other countries of an "aggressive culture", since aggressiveness is treated as something given in advance, and its social origins are left unexplained.

What are the chief methodological shortcomings of the "aggressive habit" theory that prevents the behaviourists from revealing the main causes of war? The most important is to be found in their treatment of the aggressive habit as an individual, psycho-physiological "instrumental" response of the organism, ignoring the social processes that produce an aggressive attitude to other nations, thus ascribing an equal role to such factors as social class and family in influencing the individual. The behaviourists fail to single out the main, decisive factors from the complex of external factors influencing human behaviour, for the simple reason that they do not recognise the social importance of the origins of man's "aggressive habits".

This, the chief shortcoming of the behaviourist approach to the development of the aggressive habit gives rise to another when it comes to assessing the already formed habit. The behaviourists fail to draw any distinction between the aggressiveness of different groups of people. In fact, the reproach Pear, among others, makes with respect to the psycho-analytic theory of aggressiveness, namely that it "fails to distinguish between the aggressiveness of the war-makers ... and the attitudes of the general population, many of whom may not know of the

---

[1] R. Benedict, *Patterns of Culture*, New York, 1934, p. 27.

[2] T. H. Pear, "Peace, War and Culture-Patterns", *Psychological Factors of Peace and War*, pp. 21-22.

impending war",[1] applies equally to the behaviourists themselves.

The logical outcome of these weaknesses is the view shared by behaviourists and psycho-analysts alike that the causes of war are wholly or largely psychological. Human psychology is regarded by both as the chief cause of war, with the only difference that for the psycho-analysts it is unconscious drives that underlie psychology while for the behaviourists it is habits.

Even some of the social psychologists who are prepared to accord social factors their due role in the development of an aggressive attitude to other nations are liable to adopt a one-sided psychological approach to the origins of war. The most notable in this respect is Erich Fromm, leader of the school of "culture psycho-analysis", who claims to be a Marxist.

Fromm's idealism is patently evident in his views on the origins of war in our own age. "We live in one world," he writes, "yet in his feelings and thoughts contemporary man still lives in the nation state.... This anachronism can only lead to disaster."[2] Thus, the main cause of war is not the policies of certain social classes but the fact that the thoughts and feelings of modern man belong to a past age. In another work Fromm maintains—and this view is shared by many other psychologists—that "the chief potential cause of war is fear" of nuclear weapons, shattering people's hope and forcing them to deny the existence of a mortal danger, and producing mass paranoia and schizophrenia.[3]

In one of his latter works, Fromm apparently sought to somewhat revise his theory which emphasised the social-psychological causes of war. He tried to get away from the "defeatist attitude" that war was inevitable due to man's innate drive towards destruction. Fromm's exposure of the weaknesses of this view does not however represent a fundamental departure from his earlier approach. "Wars," he writes, "are the result of the decision of political, military, and business leaders to wage war for the sake of gaining territory, natural resources, advantages in trade...."[4] According to this logic, modern wars

---

[1] T. H. Pear, op. cit., p. 40.

[2] E. Fromm, *Beyond the Chains of Illusion. My Encounter with Marx and Freud*, New York, 1962, p. 171.

[3] E. Fromm, "The Case for Unilateral Disarmament", *Daedalus*, 1960, Vol. 8, No. 4.

[4] E. Fromm, *The Heart of Man. Its Genius for Good and Evil*, New York, 1964, p. 22.

are caused not by the economics and policies of imperialism, but are simply the result of a decision that may be taken by the leaders of any state, capitalist or socialist.

Throughout the book, Fromm continues to place the main emphasis on the unconscious drives of "modern man", like the all-pervasive tendency to narcissism and so on. Fromm tries to reveal the secret of history through "global" social-psychological theorising: "Protestants against Catholics, French against Germans, whites against blacks, Aryans against non-Aryans, Communists against capitalists; different as the contents are, psychologically we deal with the same narcissistic phenomenon and its resulting fanaticism and destructiveness."[1] In place of concrete analysis of the causes of modern conflicts, Fromm offers an ever more abstract and generalised psychological theorising on different social, class, party and political interests. Fromm does not abandon this idealist, non-Marxist approach in his last book,[2] in which he more or less adopts the theory of frustration, declaring "destructiveness and violence" to be the result of the "shattering of hope".

The causes of wars are always of a concrete-historical nature, i.e., are linked with the existence of particular societies and classes, definite class interests and a particular relationship of forces. The mistake of Fromm and other social psychologists lies in their unhistorical approach, their substitution of abstract psychological causes, purporting to be valid in any society, for the real economic, political and social-psychological causes of wars.

Many social psychologists still cling to the same mistaken approach that the American sociologist L. Bernard indicated as long ago as 1944. Although not a materialist, Bernard inclined to the view that imperialism bore the responsibility for the world wars, and the fact that he understood this important point enabled him to spot the shortcomings of the psychological theories of war. "To the superficial observer, or to one who for any reason wishes to avoid 'materialist' theories of the causation of war," he wrote, "the psychological causes seem to be important ones. These causes may be called public opinion, patriotism, nationalistic spirit, race or cultural prejudices, religious intolerance, or any other set of opinions, beliefs or

---

[1] E. Fromm, *The Heart of Man...*, pp. 82-83.

[2] E. Fromm, *The Revolution of Hope. Toward a Humanized Technology*, New York, 1968.

ideologies. But back of them almost invariably lie those economic causes which have conditioned them."[1]

Non-Marxist social psychologists sometimes recognise the role of economics and politics in their study of the causes of war, but they do so simply to make their analysis appear as comprehensive as possible and forestal possible accusations of one-sidedness, and not in order to give a materialist explanation to socio-psychological conceptions.

The general tendency in Western social psychology to overlook the primary politico-economic causes of war in favour of the secondary, socio-psychological causes, which are in fact derivative from the former, is objectively advantageous to the imperialist bourgeoisie who are eager to conceal their vested interest in the arms race and the class nature of their aggressive policy towards the socialist countries.

## The Prevention of War in Western Social Psychology

In present-day Western social psychology it is very rare indeed that we come across theories deliberately expressing the idea that another world war is inevitable. Such fatalism has generally been abandoned. Nevertheless, the idealism which prevails in Western sociology is an obstacle to a realistic approach to the problem of preventing war. This idealistic approach, as expressed in a "supraclass" viewpoint, and a tendency to extend to the whole of society conclusions drawn from experiments or observations conducted with individuals and groups of people, renders many of the theories rather ineffectual and greatly limits the field of their practical application in the peace movement.

In examining the socio-psychological theories of ensuring peace, it should be borne in mind that social psychology and sociology are interpenetrative, so that it is necessary to examine the theories of both psychologists and sociologists alike.

The psycho-analysts, with their theory of innate human drives and instincts, regard the problem of preventing war either as that of "sublimation" of aggressive impulses, the directing of such impulses along socially acceptable channels, or as a

[1] L. L. Bernard, *War and Its Causes*, New York, 1944, p. 328.

problem of the individual overcoming his defects by moral self-perfection.

As regards the former, the psycho-analysts claim that unless society allows its members a free outlet for their aggressive drives, they will transfer their aggressive energies from internal to outside targets, i.e., other countries and peoples. Thus, in order to avoid hostility towards other countries, society should provide harmless outlets for aggressive energy, by encouraging competition, sport, and struggle against disease and various other evils, the idea being that free expression of aggressive impulses in personal relationships considerably weakens aggressiveness towards "outside groups".

The theory of "sublimation" has been rejected by many social psychologists and even by some psycho-analysts. It is also refuted by the facts of modern capitalist life in the USA. Here, indeed, is a country where there are quite ample opportunities for practising sport, where, judging by the crime rate, there are better opportunities than anywhere else in the world for free expression of "aggressive instincts", and where racial disturbances have government sanction. Yet, despite the wide range of outlets for aggressiveness provided in American society—from sport to the assassination of presidents—the aggressiveness of the power elite towards the socialist countries and all peace-loving peoples, far from declining, is actually on the increase.

The theory of "sublimation" is extremely ambivalent. Those psycho-analysts who attach the greatest importance to international peace can use it to recommend the encouragement of aggressiveness within society, to the damage of public order and social unity, while those who would have peace within society at any cost can use the theory equally well to support society's encouragement of hostility towards other peoples. In either case, it is simply a question of inevitable aggressiveness being transferred from one object to another.

This "theory" is so abstract and mechanistic that it can be used equally well to support international peace or racial hostility, depending on subjective inclination.

The psycho-analytic theories of moral perfection all rely exclusively on the efforts of the individual to re-educate himself. According to one such view, man does not merely perceive his Ego but projects a "psychological shadow" of it, or rather of that aspect of his personality of which he is ignorant or ashamed. This shadow is usually transferred to another per-

son or group of persons who become enemies, which enables the subject to take cognizance of his own existence. This view is held by J. L. Henderson, who writes: "Our individual and group Egos necessarily produce shadows, which necessarily fall somewhere, and there reside our enemies, without whom we could have no assurance of our own existence." It is this dichotomy that represents the grave threat to peace. Henderson continues: "The reason why most international relations are destructive of one another is man's inability or unwillingness to recognise and accept this unavoidable split within himself."[1]

According to M. Klein and H. Jones, it is not the whole psychological Ego that is split but only the feelings. Before the split occurs positive and negative feelings are in a confused, "ambivalent" state, and are present in many relationships with other people. If the burden of inner aggressiveness is very great, the feelings split, and the friendly feelings are directed onto one's own group, which becomes "wholly good" and the hostile feelings are directed towards an alien "outside" group, which becomes "wholly bad". This is how aggressive relationships between certain groups and nations arise.

Henderson suggests that the psychological causes of war can be eliminated by a new awareness of the middle point of one's personality, the point, that is, where the conscious and the unconscious are balanced: men have to "re-discover today that part of themselves which does not cast a shadow. This will enable them to dispense with their psychological need of enemies. . . ."[2] Henderson does not indicate what practical steps should be taken to resolve the problem of his own making, but merely speaks of some "material and spiritual disciplines" whereby the Self can be cognised and educated.

Maurice L. Farber disagrees with those psycho-analysts who claim that the main psychological cause of war is to be found in mankind as a whole: according to him it is to be found only in the psychology of government leaders.[3] The latter have at their disposal certain means whereby they can awaken aggressive sentiments in the masses. Thus, the main cause of wars could be eliminated by establishing control over the aggressiveness of

---

[1] J. L. Henderson, "Psychological Implications of an Alternative to War", *Alternatives to War and Violence—A Search*, London, 1963, p. 15.

[2] Ibid., p. 17.

[3] M. L. Farber, "The Anal Character and Political Aggression", *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, November 1955, Vol. 51, No. 3.

leaders. He suggests compulsory therapy for the leaders of all nations, and thinks it would be a good thing if the masses also submitted to special treatment to make them less responsive to the aggressive policies of their leaders. Unfortunately, he fails to explain who should be entrusted with carrying out this treatment or even what sort of treatment he intends. His suggestions seem to count entirely on the good will and willingness to co-operate of the leaders themselves.

We find this same appeal for the moral perfection of leaders in the theories of R. K. White. According to White, the vast majority of people in all countries do not think in terms of black and white but in terms of compromise, of finding a middle way between extremes. Psychologically, most people hold the same "modal philosophy", and "...instead of falling apart into two hostile camps ... the human race seems to have been pulling closer together on questions of social philosophy and has now arrived at a fair degree of consensus". The conflict between capitalism and socialism is "outmoded", because "the men-in-the-street have been stubbornly holding out for an undramatic middle position...".[1]

A closer look at this "modal philosophy" shows it to be a typical bourgeois philosophy. Its main propositions, to quote White himself, are the faith of the "modal individual" in "free enterprise", the desire of the masses to see the capitalists under "popular control" (apparently, under imaginary control), and the great importance individuals attach to political freedom. Naively believing that this "modal philosophy" combines capitalist and socialist principles, White sees it as a means of achieving lasting peace, if only it could be adopted by political leaders. He urges Western statesmen to hurry up and announce their support for the modal philosophy. In case he does not know it, Western leaders have long since adopted the political and economic demagogy—i.e., the idea of "rule by the people" in capitalist countries—which he mistook for the philosophy of the masses.

H. Jones, another psycho-analyst of the "split feelings" school, makes two suggestions for "psychological prophylactic treatment against war". The first is more tolerant methods in educating the younger generation, and the second is to make things easier for the adult members of society, since even those

[1] R. K. White, "The Cold War and the Modal Philosophy", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1958, Vol. II, No. 1, p. 45.

who have received the best education can experience frequent crises giving rise to aggression. The latter suggestion is most typical of those social psychologists who hold the view that aggressive behaviour is a product of frustration. They consider that the aggressive attitude of certain sections of the population in capitalist countries to the Negroes, the Jews, the Communists and other groups is based on "economic frustration". As R. Stagner, another supporter of the frustration theory, writes: "Economic insecurity is also a major factor in anti-Semitism, persecution of racial groups, and other 'scapegoat' reactions."[1] However, the realistic attitude embodied in this accurate observation is wholly lacking in his recommendation for the establishment of "industrial democracy", since this is quite impracticable in capitalist society.

J. C. Flugel holds that in order to overcome frustrations steps must be taken to remove the causes of adult discontent, among which he includes "physical hardships caused by lack of food, housing, clothing, etc., together with the threats of hardship connected with economic insecurity and unemployment".[2] Like Stagner, he campaigns for "industrial democracy", but he seems to be aware that this is by no means enough to ensure international peace. On the basis of the theory of "the psychological need for enemies", he advises man to choose nature as his common enemy and unite to combat it. In other words, in order to avoid war, man should take the path of moral self-perfection, forget the differences that divide, and invent a common "non-human enemy".

Berkowitz demonstrates similar wishful thinking in expressing the hope that "competition between groups could be minimised" and "peace and harmony" propagated. An energetic defender of the theory of frustration, Berkowitz nevertheless rightly rejects the idea that the main sources of frustration productive of social aggressiveness can be removed in Western society. "The most direct procedure for reducing inter-group conflict, of course, would be to lessen the occurrence of frustrations.

"...but obviously, little actually can be achieved along these lines ... there is no real prospect for eliminating more than a few of the many sources of anxiety and insecurity in our society."[3]

[1] R. Stagner, *Psychology of Personality*, New York, 1961, p. 528.
[2] J. C. Flugel, op. cit., p. 132.
[3] Berkowitz, op. cit., p. 185.

Many of the behaviourist proposals for the elimination of war are similar, if not identical, to those made by the psycho-analysts. This is hardly surprising for two reasons. Firstly, the same general approach underlies all the different trends and schools of Western social psychology—namely, an idealist view of social development, a positivist interpretation of social phenomena, sectarian social-psychological generalisations, lack of political commitment with regard to class and party struggles. Secondly, the various Western trends and schools of social psychology show great interpenetration and mutual influence.

The behaviourist A. Buss, like many psycho-analysts, would combat aggressiveness in children from an early age. However, the methods he proposes differ radically from those suggested by the psycho-analysts. While the latter recommend that children be given plenty of opportunity to satisfy their aggressive impulses, he and other behaviourists advise the "uprooting" of aggression. "Habit strength of aggression," he writes, "is also weakened by punishment, whether the mechanism is direct weakening of the habit or the strengthening of incompatible habits."[1]

Peaceful habits are the main thing the behaviourists are interested in implanting in children through education.

As to the methods of education, some psychologists try to avoid both the extreme liberalism of the psycho-analysts and the radicalism of the behaviourists. Thus, M. Argyle proposes the following eclectical course of action: at "any rate overtly aggressive behaviour can be trained out by suitable socialisation technique—warm relations with parents who do not permit aggressive behaviour and do not punish it."[2]

Lentz regards scientific investigation of methods of achieving peace as the way to save mankind from the threat of war. The basic premise underlying his book is that "the knowledge necessary for effective peace action is not now possessed by man".[3] The problem, as he sees it, is that "men do not want war but ... they want what causes war...", and thus, "better knowledge of these causes and of more desirable alternatives might quickly change their behaviour".[4] Thus, according to Lentz, the whole trouble lies in our failure to understand the causes of war. He is

[1] A. H. Buss, op. cit., p. 199.
[2] M. Argyle, *Psychology and Social Problems*, London, 1964, p. 57.
[3] T. F. Lentz, op. cit., p. 56.
[4] Ibid., p. 72.

apparently blissfully unaware of the existence of the class interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie trying to hold on to their positions by force of arms, or powerful monopolies making a fortune out of the arms race.

Scientific investigation of the ways to ensure peace is certainly necessary, but it is absurd to maintain that the true source of wars is still unknown in our age. Failure to indicate the true source of wars—imperialism—is practically speaking to condone imperialist policy. Moreover, it shows exceptional political naïvete to imagine that in bourgeois society knowledge can bring about a change of heart on the part of the imperialists and cause them to adopt new ideas without a political struggle. This is but a utopian dream of the moral self-perfection of the bourgeoisie.

The idea of moral self-perfection underlies numerous Western social-psychological theories for ending war advanced by psychologists and sociologists alike. One such theory is the idea of "unilateral mutual disarmament" proposed by the well-known American psychologist C. Osgood. According to him, a real struggle is now in progress to alter the system of beliefs upheld by any group of people when these beliefs conflict with our own. He insists that this struggle is not politico-economic but purely ideological and psychological: "We are fighting to preserve a way of life, a system of beliefs, an ideology, if you will."[1]

This one-sided, idealist conception of the struggle being waged in the world today leads Osgood to attribute the chief causes of the arms race to the distorted reflections of reality produced by the mental mechanisms. One of the latter is an indefinable "psycho-logic" which determines numerous human actions. Thus, "psycho-logic" dictates to the American that his people is good, kind, honest and just, while the Russians are bad, unjust, etc.

Osgood protests against distorted views of the communist world. Although he shares several of the more common American prejudices about communism, he condemns attempts to fling mud at the Soviet Union. He writes: "The Russian people suffered more ... than any other during World War II; they have had reason to perceive an external threat for a long period...."[2]

[1] C. E. Osgood, "Suggestions for Winning the Real War with Communism", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. III, No. 4, Dec. 1959, p. 296.
[2] Ibid., p. 314.

However, Osgood overlooks the fact that the bourgeois psychology is derived from deeper, material processes of bourgeois society. Therefore, his call for "graduated unilateral disarmament" in fact only hinges on a sudden chance flash of vision among US leaders, on Western politicians breaking out of the vicious circle of "psycho-logic" by their own will power and awareness.

The proposal for "graduated unilateral disarmament" advanced by the American sociologist A. Etzioni likewise bears a plain idealist stamp. Although he is right in regarding the unilateral stand (for complete and immediate unilateral disarmament) as a "politically impotent" doctrine in the USA, his own view is based on the same fallacy as the one he is criticising: he, too, attaches great importance to "the removal of 'psycho-logic' pressure" in carrying his proposed programme into effect. "What is needed, and what might work under the present conditions, is a policy that will break this vicious circle of suspicion and remove the mental blocs and psychological barriers of both sides."[1]

He would appear to be suggesting that the first impulse towards the new policy must come from the conscience and good will of Western leaders realising the evil of the arms race and the advantages of a peaceful policy. His programme is based on the idealistic assumption that Western leaders can adopt a new policy as an act of moral awareness and through the enlightening activity of supporters of the peace movement. There is indeed, of course, a real chance of a change in Western policy, but such a change can only be brought about by the political struggle of progressive forces on a global scale and within the capitalist countries themselves, and not by the "conversion" of Western leaders through any form of agitation.

Self-perfection seems to be the chief hope of sociologists and political science experts. Of the latter, for example, E. Stillman and W. Pfaff express the idealistic view in their book, *The Politics of Hysteria. The Sources of Twentieth-Century Conflict*, that the chief motive force in Western history was and remains the "longing for perfection", man's desire to control both his physical and social environment. They hold that this resulted in great material and cultural achievements on the one hand, and enormous crimes, "violence on a horrific scale" and wars, on the other.

---

[1] A. Etzioni, op. cit., p. 93.

The great political weakness of the social-psychology peace theories lies in the extremely limited and ineffectual practical solutions they offer. The proposed measures for reducing "the aggressiveness" of children, for establishing "industrial democracy", developing sport, declaring war on disease, and so on, might possibly lead to a reduction of juvenile crime in the USA, and to a certain improvement in public welfare, and might conceivably lead to a certain decrease in general violence in the USA and other capitalist societies, but they could hardly be expected to remove the basic sources of the aggressiveness of bourgeois ruling groups.

Several Western scholars, realising the limited value and obvious insufficiency of petty reforms, call for a radical change in Western policy and fundamental transformation of the state political structure. Some of their proposals contain valuable ideas on the principle of mutual concessions, on the gradual nature of the necessary change in relations between the capitalist and socialist countries. The propaganda by many social psychologists and sociologists of such means of reducing international tension as developing international ties in various spheres, co-operation (e.g., in space research), reduction of armaments, the withdrawal of troops, and many others, have a definite progressive significance. The criticism of the policies of Western governments that often accompanies social-psychological peace theories also plays a positive role. Thus, Etzioni sharply criticises the American plan for "armaments control", condemns the mood of Russophobia prevailing in the USA, and the bandying about for propaganda purposes of such abstract symbols as "the Free World" and so on. According to Etzioni, many Americans are "infested with suspicions of the Communists, fears over bombs secretly hidden by the other side. . . ."[1]

However, such criticism of the political situation in the West does not really touch upon the basic causes of war preparations and cannot conceal the serious weaknesses of social-psychological theories for transforming international relations. Their main fault is the utopian premise that on being presented with a good plan for ensuring peace, the imperialist bourgeois leaders would willingly embrace the new ideas, and, through a new-found awareness, adopt a new policy.

A general weakness of the socio-psychological peace theo-

[1] Ibid., p. 77.

ries taken as a whole is the fact that they contradict one another. Some scholars maintain that aggressiveness can be "curbed" by sport, games, etc., while others insist that they merely serve to increase it. Some hold that contacts between people in different spheres lead to a reduction of cold war tensions, while others insist that such contacts merely increase hostility. Obviously, divergences of opinion are inevitable in the quest for truth, but if such differences become an end in themselves, if they fail to produce a single theory and a common strategy and tactics, the result is a fruitless intellectual tug-of-war, everyone pulling energetically in his own direction and thus getting nowhere with the main issue—the task of abolishing war.

## The Role of Scientific Social Psychology in Investigation of Problems of War and Peace

No review of socio-psychological theories of the origins and means of preventing war would be complete without some attempt to assess the role of social psychology in the study of problems of war and peace. The question might be put as follows: has social psychology any use in analysis of the causes of wars and the means of preventing them? We have no hesitation in reaching a positive verdict.

After all, the cause of wars in the present age is imperialism, which, as a socio-economic system, includes not only a sum of certain economic relations but at the same time a certain political, ideological and socio-psychological superstructure. Thus, the cause of war in the present age is the sum total, or rather the combination of imperialist economics, and the policies, ideology and social psychology of the imperialist bourgeoisie. The psychology of the imperialist bourgeoisie and the methods it uses to influence the psychology of other social strata and classes in bourgeois society is one of the links in the causal chain leading to wars. It is an important link, but naturally not the chief one, being simply a product of imperialist economy and policy. The bourgeoisie is well aware of the role of social psychology in the cold war and in the preparation and waging of imperialist wars. The US Department of Defence

employs a large number of psychologists. T. Lentz remarked: "The newest division of the American Psychological Association is the division of military psychology. Doubtless the largest employer of psychologists in the US is the Department of Defence."[1]

The imperialists go out of their way to use psychology for cold war purposes. Strausz-Hupé, Kintner and Possony, who are to be counted among the most ardent supporters of the cold war, declare that "a free and open society should not be afraid to engage in propaganda and to conduct a psychological campaign in pursuit of its goals".[2] The imperialists and the scholars in their service resort to psychological warfare in the ideological struggle. The above-named writers include the following among the chief goals of America's psychological campaign: battle with Marxist-Leninist ideas, the dissemination of bourgeois ideas in the socialist countries, and propaganda of the "ideals of freedom" in the newly-liberated countries.

The study of socio-psychological phenomena in bourgeois society occupies an extremely important place in the matter of discovering the causes of war and the ways to prevent it. But in order to be really scientific, such study must examine socio-psychological factors as products of economic and political relations in a given society, while recognising the relative independence of ideology and social psychology, without which they would simply represent a mere reflection of economic and political processes.

The chief defect of the socio-psychological theories examined above is that they either tend to exaggerate the relative independence of social psychology or treat psychological processes as the decisive factor of social development. In either case, the result is an idealistic approach to the subject, and a failure to recognise the decisive role of imperialist economy and bourgeois class policies in preparations for war. Yet, if one penetrates this idealistic coating, one can perceive numerous positive elements in many Western scholars' treatment of the socio-psychological problems of war and peace, provided one views them from a materialist standpoint.

Let us take by way of example the question of "psychologi-

---

[1] T. E. Lentz, op. cit., p. 156. We do not propose to discuss here the problems of military psychology; this is a vast separate subject, lying beyond the scope of this book.

[2] R. Strausz-Hupé, W. R. Kintner, S. T. Possony, *A Forward Strategy for America*, New York, 1961, p. 260.

cal obstacles" to mutual understanding and international agreements. One of these, in the opinion of Osgood, is the fact that "it is congruent for us to dislike things that people we dislike are in favour of".[1] If we approach this from the historical idealist standpoint of the author himself it would appear that the psychological obstacles in question and others like them account for the unwillingness of Western leaders to agree to general disarmament, the imperialists and the leaders of the socialist countries being equally hostile to everything that the other side is in favour of.

If, however, we interpret it from a materialist standpoint, we cannot fail to see that, firstly, the method of outright rejection of all the other side is in favour of is typical of the imperialist politicians and ideologists alarmed at the rise of socialism, and, secondly, that the removal of this psychological obstacle would lead to an improvement of the international situation.

Valuable ideas (again provided they are interpreted from the materialist standpoint) are also expressed by Western scholars concerning the role of stereotype formulae in shaping an aggressive social psychology in the capitalist countries. The exposure of the psychological undercurrents of the ideological devices employed by imperialist propaganda, of those stereotype formulae whereby the imperialists seek to shape public opinion, is of great importance in the ideological struggle to prevent a world war.

There is a certain amount of truth, for example, in Fromm's definition of the psychological influence of the nuclear threat on Western society (though it must be said that Fromm is greatly mistaken in supposing the nuclear threat to have the same influence on all societies). Fromm writes: "To live for any length of time under the constant threat of destruction creates certain psychological effects in most human beings—fright, hostility, callousness, a hardening of the heart, and a resulting indifference to all the values we cherish. Such conditions will transform us into barbarians."[2]

Methodological errors and defects cannot conceal the numerous positive results Western social psychologists have obtained in their research into the origins of war and the means

---

[1] C. E. Osgood, op. cit., p. 307.

[2] E. Fromm, "The Case for Unilateral Disarmament", *Daedalus*, 1960, Vol. 9, No. 4, p. 1019.

to prevent them. In the vast majority of cases, such research is empirical so that the results often faithfully reflect certain aspects of socio-psychological life of bourgeois society. There is therefore no doubt at all but that these realistic deductions and observations will find a place in scientific social psychology devoted to the study of socio-psychological aspects of international relations.

* * *

It goes without saying that social psychology alone is not enough to provide a solution to the problems of the origins of wars and the ways and means of preventing them. In order to preserve universal peace and hold in check the imperialist aggressors it is necessary to make constant efforts to increase the vigilance of the peoples of the world, make use of international organisations, adopt various forms of struggle with the warmongers, mobilise the peace movement, draw in the widest possible sections of the population in capitalist countries, expose ideology and schemes involved in preparing and carrying into effect military provocations and irresponsible ventures.

On the level of interstate relations the quest for peace takes the form of resolute, effective opposition to the reactionary aggressive policies of the imperialist countries by close solidarity between the socialist countries and independent sovereign national states to curb the forces of reaction.

One of the means of opposing the aggressive policy of the imperialists is active exposure of aggressors in the UN and other international organisations.

Future successes in the struggle against the threat of war, the struggle to put an end to military intervention and prevent the outbreak of another world war depend to a large extent on the development in breadth, depth and scope, on a truly international scale, of the peace movement, to include all who are in favour of peace, irrespective of their political views and world outlook.

It would be hard to exaggerate the importance in this struggle of a correct, scientific understanding of the ways in which peace can be achieved, and hence of the theories advanced by various social groups that might provide a practical solution to problems of war and peace. It is to analysis of such theories that the following part of this book is devoted.

# III
# AGAINST THE IDEOLOGY OF MILITARISM AND REACTION. FOR PEACE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

## Chapter X

# AMERICAN DOCTRINES OF POWER POLITICS

### The Social Roots and Features of the Doctrines of Power Politics in the USA

Doctrines and theories whose purpose is to justify the use of violence in international relations—imperialist "power politics"—are becoming more and more common in US bourgeois sociology.[1] This is a reflection of objective processes, namely the growing role of violence in imperialist politics, and is the result of a deliberate effort to find new ways of deceiving the masses, new methods of ideological influence.

There are two main reasons for the growing demand for new doctrines and theories to justify imperialist "power politics".

Firstly, the increased political awareness of the masses and the mobilisation of the peace movement compel the imperialist bourgeoisie to resort to all sorts of pseudo-scientific theories combining justification of the use of violence with more subtle methods of explaining the grounds for so doing. Sociological doctrines masking the real source of the threat of war are intended above all to pull the wool over the eyes of wide sections of the public in the capitalist West.[2]

---

[1] The following definition of "political science" is characteristic in this respect: "It is with power in society that political science is primarily concerned...." (W. A. Robson, *The University Teaching of Social Sciences. Political Science.* A Report prepared by W. A. Robson, on behalf of the International Political Science Association, UNESCO, Paris, April 1954, p. 17.)

[2] A remark by a Western politician, L. Pearson, is not without interest in this connection: "If current opinions and popular prejudices

Secondly, the highly destructive character of modern warfare and changes in the world balance of power in favour of socialism have given rise to certain doubts about the expediency of "power politics", especially in the forms adopted hitherto. Hence the attempts of the most reactionary forces of imperialism to make use of sociological doctrines to instil reactionary political views in the masses and strengthen the determination of the ruling groups to conduct an international policy of war and violence.

Sociological "justification" of war and violence has become particularly widespread in the United States of America.

During the Second World War, when reactionary groups in the United States were already planning to use the defeat of nazi Germany and militarist Japan in the interests of ensuring their own world hegemony, geopolitical and racist doctrines became current in American sociological literature.

In the American environment, however, the sociological doctrines designed to justify power politics, the ideology of the struggle for world hegemony, acquired certain typical features of the ideology and politics of American imperialism. These involve the manipulation of a wide selection of unscientific sociological theories that distort the question of the nature and causes of war, psychological theories, and, especially, the careful camouflaging of power politics in pseudo-democratic garb.

At different periods, representing various swings in American foreign policy connected with the current international balance of power and the development of the class struggle within the country, different aspects of political ideology and different doctrines and theories came to the fore.

The following stages can be distinguished in the development of these political and sociological theories: the first, from the end of the Second World War to the early fifties; the second from then to the early sixties, and the third from the early sixties to the present time.

The first stage was characterised by geopolitical doctrines and various nationalist theories of America's "special role", her "mission" to rule the "Western World". They had their socio-economic and political roots in American imperialist dom-

---

are not to impose themselves with relentless force on our minds, we must judge them in the light of historical knowledge and historical experience, and of the truths that have been tested by such experience." (Lester B. Pearson, *Democracy in World Politics*, New York, 1955, p. V.)

ination in the post-war capitalist world, and were designed to fan anti-communist sentiments, in connection with the beginning of the cold war against the Soviet Union, the creation of NATO and other aggressive military blocs.

The second stage corresponded to the emergence of the world socialist system as a powerful factor in international relations, and was marked by an already clearly definable crisis of America's aggressive power politics.

This stage saw the emergence and spread of the doctrine of "political realism", designed to conceal by more subtle means than hitherto had been the case the threat to peace constituted by imperialism. The aim was to present the imperialist policy of the ruling groups to the public as being dictated by "political reality", and the very "essence" and "nature" of man. The doctrine was several times revised and "brought up to date" to correspond to changes in the bourgeois political camp, reflecting the struggle of various foreign policy courses and the crisis of power politics. In fact, it evolved so much that many of its supporters were forced by confrontation with actuality to renounce some of the original cardinal principles of the doctrine.

Typical in this respect was the evolution to be observed in the views of one of the founders of the doctrine of "political realism", H. Morgenthau, who as early as 1960 abandoned (though only very cautiously) the thesis of military-political force being the only effective means of resolving international problems, and in 1965 openly condemned the American aggression in Vietnam.

It should be pointed out, however, that despite differences in the views of its supporters and the fact that many bourgeois sociologists have rejected some of its basic original tenets, the doctrine is still flourishing and continues to exert a considerable influence on all the major concepts of power politics.

The third stage has been characterised by mounting reactionary tendencies in US home and foreign policy, the growing influence on foreign affairs sociology of the political ideology of various "ultra", semi-fascist currents, Goldwaterism and Birchism, notable for extreme anti-communism, racism and neo-colonialism, and last but not least, ideas of counter-revolutionary violence, as expressed in the aggressive anti-communist conceptions of US ruling circles, whose aim is to halt the world revolutionary process by force of arms.

This stage has seen the "stepping up" of the USA's policy

of aggression, violence and colonial revenge—viz., Indochina, Africa, the Middle East and several other parts of the world.

Neo-conservatism, reflecting the most reactionary and aggressive features of the ideology and foreign policy of the "War Party" in the USA, and representing a synthesis of the most reactionary features of the doctrine of "political realism", American racism and geopolitics, is more and more becoming the theoretical foundation of the sociology of international relations in the USA.

After the Second World War military sociology was in vogue in the United States; many military experts took to writing sociological treatises while sociologists began to try their hand at military topics. Today, this process of splicing aggressive military theory and reactionary military sociology has gone a long way. Military-sociological doctrines and theories are becoming more and more a component part of American bourgeois sociology of international affairs, providing the theoretical justification for imperialist power politics.

## The Philosophical Foundations of the Doctrine of Violence. The Doctrine of "Political Realism"

The philosophical-methodological basis of the sociological doctrines that justify power politics is an idealistic approach to politics as a whole, and to international relations in particular. Although outwardly extremely heterogeneous, these doctrines all represent, from the point of view of methodology, theories of subjective or objective idealism, often combined with elements of vulgar materialism.

In American bourgeois sociology of international relations there exists a traditional line between "political idealism" and "political realism". In practice, however, the only methodological difference between them is that the former is an abstract idealist approach treating subjective moral factors as the basis of international relations, while the latter is an empirico-positivist form of idealism including elements of vulgar materialism (especially, as we shall see, in the interpretation of "violence").

The doctrine of political realism is the one usually resorted to for the purpose of justifying power politics.[1]

Political realism analyses a number of social concepts and categories concerning the essence of politics and international relations ("power", "interest", "will", "human nature", "the nature of international relations", etc.). The aggressive foreign policy of imperialism is invariably treated as the inevitable product of "political reality", human nature and the character of international affairs.

Naturally, a doctrine based on the old worn thesis that violence is the main instrument of politics and derives inevitably from "real" political relations is nothing new in bourgeois ideology. What is special about this particular doctrine is that it is raised to the status of a "universal" theory of imperialist foreign policy that has a considerable influence on other unscientific sociological theories of international politics.

The doctrine of political realism was mobilised above all in the sphere of geopolitics—the straight "deduction" of aggressive foreign policy from existing geographical factors—represented by numerous pre- and post-war works by Spykman[2] and others, and several recently published works including *Geography and Politics in a World Divided* by Professor S. Cohen of Boston University.

Political realism is based on American pragmatist philosophy with its elements of vulgar materialism. Thus, the main object of the political theories of the American sociologists Merriam and Lasswell that arose in the thirties under the influence of the pragmatists, was to create the impression of a clean break with the formal "institutional" approach to politics. They claimed to be writing about real political phenomena and analysing the political dynamics of society.

The supporters of the realist doctrine generally stress its "empirical and pragmatist" nature, pointing out that, unlike so many other politico-philosophical movements, they avoid

---

[1] "Political idealism", traditionally regarded by bourgeois ideologists as rejection of the use of violence, has more recently become a means of justifying various reactionary foreign policies, involving above all ideological and propaganda service to the aggressive policy of imperialism in the so-called psychological war. (See, for example, *Propaganda and International Relations*, San Francisco, 1962, and M. Donelan, *The Ideas of American Foreign Policy*, New York, 1963.

[2] See N. Spykman, *The Geography of Peace*, New York, 1949, and *America's Strategy in World Politics*, New York, 1942.

all abstract theorising. It is indeed true that essential categories of international relations like "power" and "interest" in politics and "political reality" in international affairs do occupy a central place in the sociological doctrine of political realism: but they are treated idealistically and metaphysically.

The cornerstone of the doctrine of political realism is the proposition that "interest" is the basis of politics. As Morgenthau writes, "the idea of interest is indeed of the essence of politics and, as such, unaffected by the circumstances of time and place".[1]

Just what interest is meant here? What is this abstract "interest" which is independent of time and place? Interest does indeed play a very important role in politics, and its true class content is revealed in Marxist sociology.

In a class society, the interests of the various classes are determined by their economic and political position. As for the interests of individuals, they are a reflection of these interests plus certain individual features, partly influenced by personal demands, the upbringing and education they have received and so on.

Yet whatever the personal, individual element, people's interests in a class society always have a class character, and it is class interests that determine different approaches to international relations, to the fundamental issue of war and peace, and to the question of the methods by which international disagreements should be resolved. The doctrine of political realism, however, derives "interest" from such abstract categories as "human nature" and "human will", completely ignoring the question of what economic and social class factors underlie political phenomena. In view of this false premise underlying the doctrine of political realism, it can be used in typical pragmatist style to reduce the whole socio-historical process to certain "trends of power".[2] Thus, abstract "interest" is reduced to the use of naked violence, extended to all social relations. Many bourgeois sociologists go as far as to declare that the "laws of violence" are the only force at work in international relations.

---

[1] H. J. Morgenthau, *Dilemmas of Politics*, Chicago, 1958, p. 67.

[2] Charles Merriam, one of the founders of the doctrine of political realism, wrote that power completely dominates society and tends to crystallise and converge, that "the emerging trends of power are deeper down than nations, classes or other passing units...". (*Political Power, A Study of Power*, Glencoe, 1950, p. 324.)

A large proportion of the works of political philisophy published in the United States is based on postulations of this sort. Thus, Rodee, Anderson and Christol write: "Power is a primary objective of foreign policy."[1]

The most recent theories advanced by American sociologists, who, in the spirit of political realism, view modern international relations as a power conflict do not differ from the above examples. They either regard present international relations as a two-sided struggle between two superpowers, the USA and the USSR, or advance the theory of "three power-centres"—the USA, the USSR and Western Europe, and so on. N. Padelford and G. Lincoln express the view that "a central feature of world politics is the power struggle, the conflicts in which elements of power are used for resolution among the Great Powers".[2]

It is perfectly plain from this that American bourgeois sociologists completely fail to grasp the real major conflicts and the social essence of international relations. The chief contradiction of the modern age is the contradiction between socialism and capitalism. In the course of its resolution, the old, capitalist social order retires from the international arena to be replaced by the new, higher, communist order. The conflict between imperialist powers is merely a conflict between historically doomed ruling exploiter classes struggling for their own selfish interests. Bourgeois ideologists try to equate these totally different conflicts in an attempt to whitewash the aggressive policy of imperialism, by placing it in the same category as the socialist political struggle against social and national oppression, for peace and international security.

As well as failing to distinguish between qualitatively different social forces operating in the modern world, the authors of such theories also insist that military power is the basis of international relations. But since it is not to the advantage of the bourgeois ideologists at the present time to openly glorify the use of military force, they resort to more subtle, covert methods. In the above-mentioned book by Padelford and Lin-

---

[1] C. Rodee, T. Anderson, C. Christol, *Introduction to Political Science*. New York-Toronto-London, 1957, p. 534. See also T. Stanley, *American Defense and National Security* (Washington, 1956, p. 8), where the author declares that force is the basic means of achieving both general and specific state policy aims in international affairs.

[2] N. Padelford and G. Lincoln, *The Dynamics of International Politics*, New York, 1967, p. 293.

coln, the role of power is treated in the light of the theories of "social dynamics", currently very popular in bourgeois social science, theories which, purporting to analyse the mutual influence of various social factors, do a good job distorting social reality. They are based on manipulation of qualitatively different social phenomena and arbitrary selective emphasis, depending on the particular aims being pursued.

In examining the question of what factors lie at the root of present-day international relations, American sociologists refer to ideological, technological, economic and military aspects of foreign policy. While ascribing some importance to all these factors, they present military force as the foundation of foreign policy in general, and of the foreign policy of the capitalist states with regard to the socialist countries in particular.

A book by Olson and Sondermann[1] presents a similar "dynamics" of international relations, making a thorough analysis of the influence on international relations of geography, demography, economic and technological development, scientific advances and changes in the military machine. Here, too, the military factor is regarded as being of prime importance, and the authors call for generous military expenditure, stressing the all-embracing, total nature of modern warfare, and urge all-round preparations for it and the building up of stockpiles of all kinds of weapons, in view of the decisive role of military power in international politics.

These and other theories of the "dynamics" of international relations, although having the outward attributes of scientific theories, in fact represent no more than the familiar device of absolutising the role of power in politics in general and in international relations in particular which is a traditional feature of imperialist ideology.

Thus, it can be seen that the doctrine of political realism transfers the basic premises of the theory of violence to the sphere of international relations, regarding military-political force as an independent factor. This kind of approach is typical of pragmatist philosophy, with its insistence on theory as the antithesis of practice and its subjective-idealist thesis that "the truth is what is useful". The imperialist bourgeoisie have no objective socio-economic possibilities of overcoming the contradictions of capitalism and preventing the success of socialism,

---

[1] William C. Olson, Fred A. Sondermann, *The Theory and Practice of International Relations*, New Jersey, 1966.

and thus gamble on military power as a means of halting historical progress.

The supporters of political realism completely ignore the objective foundations of the development of international relations and attribute a major role to the will of imperialist ruling circles, ascribing to them the capacity to arbitrarily mould the socio-historical process to suit their own designs with the aid of military-political power.

The cult of power has always been a feature of the policy and ideology of exploiter classes, and has always been combined with adventurism and a failure to make a realist assessment of the relationship of forces, results and consequences.

This is truer than ever of the present-day policy and ideology of the imperialist bourgeoisie. The preaching of "power politics" by imperialist ideologists under the banner of "political realism" is nothing more than a cloak to cover up the irresponsible nature of such policies. This adventurist element is particularly evident in their total disregard for the vital interests of the masses. The exploiter classes have long since been acting according to the principle of "*après moi le déluge*", but today the use of force in international politics is fraught with dangers of a nuclear catastrophe, and terrible consequences for future generations.

The element of adventurism is also apparent in the subjective assessment of the present power relationship in world political development that is fundamental to political realism. It takes its departure from voluntarist concepts, since it treats power as a self-contained, self-sufficing factor, deriving solely from the will of certain individuals. Indeed, in the last resort, it is the will of political leaders that is regarded by the supporters of political realism as the decisive factor in politics.

The bourgeoisie hopes with the aid of strong personalities to create the position of power necessary to imperialism—i.e., military supremacy—so as to force the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to submit to the will of imperialist ruling circles by blackmail and dictation.

There is no denying that military power plays an important role in international relations. Marxist sociology by no means rejects the role of power and violence either in history in general or in international relations in particular. But the Marxist concept of the role of power and violence and their place in the system of social categories differs fundamentally from the bourgeois idealist and vulgar-sociological concept.

In the first place, the Marxist interpretation is in direct contrast to the idealist view of power and violence as abstract forces, as violence in general. Marxist sociology draws a clear distinction between revolutionary violence, expressing the interests and will of the masses, and counter-revolutionary violence, expressing the subjective will and interests of the exploiter classes. The doctrine of political realism, on the other hand, is an apology for the use of violence as a means of halting socio-historical progress.

Secondly, from the Marxist standpoint, violence is never a primary factor in history. The means of coercion and violence which may be employed as a manifestation of power are themselves the product of economic and social relations. In the present time the relationship of power between capitalism and socialism is produced by numerous factors, mostly economic and social. It can on no account be taken as equivalent to the sum of military power, for that would mean overlooking such important objective factors as the trends of economic, social and political development, the moral and political sentiments of the masses, and their determination to support or oppose a particular policy. Suffice it to recall how imperialist military forces have been repeatedly smashed by the firm determination of the masses to defend their revolutionary gains.

This has been demonstrated time and again, beginning with the defeat of the interventionist forces in the Civil War in Russia, to the defeat of armed intervention in Cuba, the struggle of the Vietnamese people and the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The whole history of political relations in the present, revolutionary age points to the fact that genuine political realism consists not in staking on military power but in taking careful account of the whole "parallelogram of forces" that operate in social development, to use Engels' expression.

The great fallacy of the doctrine of political realism is the way it regards military-political power as a major, self-contained factor in the resolution of international problems: in point of fact, the military-political power of states alters not through the agency of individual will, but as a result of economic and social changes.

The growth of the economic power of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, the powerful upswing of the national liberation movement and the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism, the loss by the USA of her nuclear mono-

poly, and Soviet superiority in several areas of military technology—all these factors have completely altered the relationship of forces in international politics. The consolidation and development of socialism and the exacerbation of the crisis of capitalism are inexorably tipping the scales of power, including military power, more and more in favour of socialism.

The change in the military power balance is not an isolated factor, independent of economic and social development: it is the direct outcome of the advantages of the economic and political system of socialism, advantages which are revealed above all in peaceful economic competition between the socialist system and capitalism.

Even bourgeois ideologists have been forced to admit the bankruptcy of power politics and the fact that the scales in the international arena have been tipped in favour of peace. Significant in this respect is W. Lippmann's remark that the United States is now dealing with an adversary who is equally powerful militarily and with partners who are equally powerful economically. This, he said, was something completely new for the USA, who for a hundred years had not had to face up to the old human problem of learning to live in a world where "*our will is not the only law*" (emphasis added.—*The Authors*).

Another American sociologist, Hartmann, writes that "the power alone is not determinant"—a statement that is tantamount to a refutation of the doctrine of political realism.

Ostensibly adopting a broad sociological approach to politics and international relations, the doctrine of political realism is in point of fact based on a one-sided approach to the object of cognition, on arbitrary exaggeration of one of the factors—the military-political factor. This is due to its treatment in isolation from social and economic factors, and the consequent subjective-idealist method of approach in the spirit of pragmatism.

The doctrine of political realism does not regard politics in terms of the class struggle, and its basic premises and categories (especially the central category of "political realism") are vague and eclectic. This enables it to be used to justify the policies both of the "wildmen" and of those representatives of the imperialist bourgeoisie who, while opposed to communism, consider it wiser to restrict the use of counter-revolutionary violence.

## The Fate of the Doctrine of Political Realism in the Crisis of Power Politics

As the crisis of imperialist power politics progresses, we find more and more differences developing among the supporters of the doctrine of political realism, reflecting a fierce struggle between various foreign policy theories in the imperialist camp.

The philosophical and sociological basis of the doctrine of political realism, and above all its fundamental premise that military force is an inevitable phenomenon in international relations make it an extremely convenient instrument for justifying the most reactionary political theories of the American "wildmen".

The supporters of one of these trends of "political realism", reflecting the views of the "hawks", preach the inevitability of nuclear war. The most explicit expression of the views of the "hawks" are to be found in the works of the well-known sociologist Robert Strausz-Hupé and several of his colleagues at the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania. They represent the views of those American bourgeois politicians who have learnt absolutely nothing from the lessons of the past. Their works (*Protracted Conflict*, 1959; *A Forward Strategy for America*, 1961, and others) all have as their basic premise the idea that "the logic of total nuclear war predominates throughout the entire conflict spectrum in the same manner as the law of gravity influences physical events."[1] In *A Forward Strategy for America* they insist that coexistence between such fundamentally different systems as capitalism and socialism is out of the question, and nuclear war is inevitable.

The main argument the "hawks" advance in favour of this view is that the history of mankind is a struggle for domination, and in international relations, for world domination. They refer to the fact that the conflict between Carthage and Rome ended in war: ergo, the conflict between such contrasting social systems as socialism and capitalism is bound to end in a major nuclear war. Since, according to them, war between the two systems is inevitable, it would be best to start it as soon as possible, to strike first.

---

[1] R. Strausz-Hupé, W. R. Kintner, S. T. Possony, *A Forward Strategy for America*, p. 14.

In view of the fact that the balance of power is altering in favour of the socialist system, they recommend a preventive war as a panacea. "The United States cannot renounce the first use of atomic weapons. Such a self-imposed restriction could be disastrous."[1]

One can hardly fail to notice in such theories the familiar motives of the policy US ruling groups have been conducting for years, and indeed we find frequent admissions of this by bourgeois authors. Thus, H. B. Hester, a retired brigadier general, remarked at the beginning of the sixties that for the last ten years the school of Realpolitik had almost entirely dominated the foreign policy of the United States, and that even the nightmare of the atom bomb and the H-bomb had failed to convince the West of its complete bankruptcy. He added that, terrible though it was, it was nonetheless true that some nursed the hope "that we can be the first to drop the bomb".[2] This eloquent admission, extremely rare for its frankness, pinpoints several important features of the doctrine of political realism typical of the political views of the "hawks".

However, in the present international situation, the policy of military force is extremely reckless and could have the direct consequences for the very people who conduct it.

This fact, of which the more sober bourgeois politicians are well aware, has had a definite influence on the political ideology of imperialism. It has forced some of the supporters of political realism to take into account the relationship of forces actually obtaining in the world. Thus, side by side with the "hawks", we now find a number of the supporters of the doctrine trying to find rather more expedient foreign policy methods, in view of the crisis of "power politics".

While the "hawks" are doing their utmost to convince people of the necessity for war without delay, others are devoting their efforts to producing theoretical "justification" for other methods of imperialist foreign policy.

Typical of the latter is K. Thompson, head of the sociological research department of the Rockefeller Foundation. In a book in which he sets out to examine the present content of the doctrine of political realism, in discussing the basic premises of the doctrine, he writes: "Men in politics seek power and they come into conflict with others engaged in the same quest. They

---

[1] Ibid., p. 142.
[2] Quoted from *Pravda*, May 24, 1960.

use moral justifications to cover their aspirations and thus highten and intensify the struggle."[1]

Thompson writes that the international events of the last few years have brought about a revolution in our thinking and have considerably changed and narrowed down our traditional concepts. However, he sees no reason why the theory of political realism should not continue to serve as the basis of American foreign policy. "Even if we stood alone," he writes, "the task of foreign policy would be much the same. It would call for vigour and public courage in rallying American military strength."[2]

Thompson supports the theory of "political realism" but tries to bring it up to date and adapt it to present conditions. He advises agreements and compromises in the cold war, and declares that political realism in foreign policy should not be identified with war. Nevertheless, he hastens to add that "history teaches that peace has rarely if ever been earned through surrender, weakness, or appeasement".[3] But in an age when war is fraught with such terrible dangers and a local conflict is always liable to develop into general conflict on a world scale, political realism, Thompson maintains, "falls short of assuming that war is inevitable".[4]

It is highly symptomatic that Thompson and others, unlike the "hawks", should refrain from appealing for war without delay. However, the majority of these people regard peaceful coexistence simply as a truce in the nuclear conflict or identify it with a particular stage in the cold war.

This interpretation of the principle of peaceful coexistence accounts for the form of the concrete foreign policy "recipes" they propose.

In the new world situation, bourgeois theoreticians are constantly on the lookout for means of conducting a policy based on conservation of existing social relations.

What are these "new" theories and means put forward by the supporters of the doctrine of political realism? They involve continuation of the arms race and power politics, now referred to as "nuclear balance", an updated version of the "balance of power". The latter theory served for a long period as the basic principle behind American diplomacy, which strove

---

[1] K. Thompson, *Political Realism and the Crisis of World Politics. An American Approach to Foreign Policy*, Princeton, 1960, p. 34.

[2] Ibid., p. 242.

[3] Ibid., p. 246.

[4] Ibid., p. 248.

to take advantage of differences between the European powers, extract the maximum profit from armed conflicts between them, and only intervene directly in cases when it was necessary to prevent one of the European rivals from getting too much of an upper hand. In the post-war period US ruling circles supplemented the theory of the "balance of power" with the doctrines of "deterrence", "rolling back", "liberation" and other anti-communist doctrines, the main object of which was to make use of the manpower reserves and military potential of the West European countries in the interests of the American monopolies.

The new American version of the balance of power theory is elaborated by several "political realists". Thus, G. Jackobsen and M. Lipman write: "Its main tenet is to prevent any single power from achieving a position of strength sufficient to threaten the existence of other states. On it nations relied for the maintenance of peace in the international scene."[1]

It is also treated in great detail in a book by G. Liska, of the Washington Centre of Foreign Policy Research, who tries to show that the existence of various regional military and political blocs is the best way of guaranteeing international security.

According to him, military blocs and alliances have always served the diplomacy of keeping the balance of power in international relations. But today their role is greater than ever before, since they serve the "defence of the Free World" and at the same time as an important deterrent. In this connection, he takes the opportunity to embark on detailed arguments in favour of the "balance of fear".

"The balance of fear" is an imperialist theory extremely dangerous for the future of mankind. It is as unrealistic as all the other theories of the doctrine of political realism, since it fails to reckon with a number of important facts connected with the arms race and the formation of aggressive blocs. It is the ideological counterpart to Dulles' reckless policy of "brinkmanship", and is quite incompatible with true peaceful coexistence and the strengthening of democratic principles in international relations. The continuation of the arms race definitely increases the danger of war, including the danger of a war being started by accident.

Today, however, many bourgeois ideologists find it impossible to totally ignore the realities of the world situation, and are forced at least to renounce in word, if not in deed, those

[1] G. Jackobsen, M. Lipman, *Political Science*, New York, 1955, p. 195.

principles that only recently formed the basis of the political ideology of imperialism, and above all the thesis of violence as the basis of foreign policy. Many bourgeois ideologists have been forced to admit the need for a measure of coexistence between socialism and capitalism and even the expediency of ensuring it by non-military means.

In view of the obvious crisis of the doctrine of "political realism", the more extremist imperialist groups are having to introduce various modifications to the theories of power politics. It is not surprising, therefore, that we should find the doctrine of political realism being supplemented by neo-conservatism, the most concentrated expression of the ideology and politics of violence and aggression.

## Neo-Conservatism—the Ideological Expression of Aggressive Foreign Policy

Parallel to "political realism", neo-conservatism has been growing in importance recently as a further theoretical justification for power politics in the bourgeois sociology of international relations.[1] Conservatism, the clinging to outdated ideas and institutions and opposition to progress, was associated in the past with feudal-aristocratic reaction. It was clearly expressed in the last century in the writings of such reactionaries as Joseph de Maistre in France and Disraeli in England. As the crisis of bourgeois society deepens, the imperialist bourgeoisie resort more and more frequently to conservative political ideology. Thus, the American professor M. Burns points out that in the capitalist world "... conservatism has flourished in a new and distinctive form".[2]

This "new and distinctive form" of conservatism in bourgeois

---

[1] Neo-conservatism has a great deal in common with "political realism": both are off-shoots of American pragmatism. Thus, S. Possony, who claims to be an adherent of both, writes that contemporary conservatism is "realistic conservatism", and supports "real power" as opposed to political abstractions. See S. Possony, "The Challenge of Crisis. Preliminary Thought on a Conservative Defense Doctrine", *What is Conservatism?*, New York, 1964.

[2] M. Burns, *Ideas in Conflict. The Political Theories of the Contemporary World*, New York, 1960, p. 315.

sociology is characterised by the attempt to cloak neo-fascist ideas, political reaction and aggression in more respectable garb, and sanctify the policy of counter-revolutionary force on the basis of extra-temporal, and hence, supraclass conservative principles. If in the doctrine of political realism the need for an aggressive foreign policy is derived from the nature of man as a social being fighting for definite concrete interests, neo-conservatism aims to justify the policy of violence in international relations by the "divine sanction" of the religious-idealist world view, trying to present it as having nothing at all to do with political reaction, as an eternal, extra-temporal phenomenon.

This is stated in quite unambiguous terms in the preface to the book *The Conscience of a Conservative* by Barry Goldwater. "The principles on which the Conservative position is based have been established by a process that has nothing to do with the social, economic and political landscape that changes from decade to decade and from century to century. These principles are derived from the nature of man, and from the truths that God has revealed about His creation."[1] This kind of metaphysical approach to politics is designed to conceal the chief purpose of the sociology of modern conservatism—apologetics for social and national inequality.

For the conservative, old or new, "except in an ultimate moral sense, men are unequal. Social organization ... always includes a variety of classes, orders, and groups. Differentiation, hierarchy, and leadership are the inevitable characteristics of any civil society."[2]

It is significant that the idea that society should be ruled by a chosen few, by an elite, and that democracy is an inexpedient form of social organisation runs like a golden thread all through the modern conservative trend of bourgeois sociology.[3]

Contemporary bourgeois conservatism, like the conservatism of the nineteenth-century aristocracy, is completely backward-looking. For the solution of twentieth century problems it prescribes one of the time-hallowed recipes of the exploiter classes: the use of force—police coercion at home and military aggres-

---

[1] B. Goldwater, *The Conscience of a Conservative*, New York, 1960, p. 5.

[2] Samuel P. Huntington, "Conservatism as an Ideology", *Political Thought Since World War II*, Ed. by W. J. Stankiewicz, London, 1964, p. 358.

[3] Clinton Rossiter, *Conservatism in America*, New York, 1955.

sion abroad—for the purpose of maintaining social and national inequality.

In the old conservative tradition, neo-conservatism aims to create a kind of "Holy Alliance", comparable to the one set up by reactionary aristocracy in the early 19th century for the purpose of opposing bourgeois revolutions.

Times have changed, and the bourgeoisie has changed from being the revolutionary class to become a counter-revolutionary class, its ideologists going all out to glorify the new "Holy Alliance" of reaction—NATO and other aggressive military blocs, directed against social progress. Thus, the American sociologist C. Rossiter declares that conservatism "is a Western phenomenon, a philosophy peculiar to the Atlantic community and certain of its extensions throughout the world".[1] Which brings us to the geopolitical and racist elements present in modern conservatism, whose numerous supporters are fond of harping on about the superiority of "Atlantic civilisation" and the Anglo-Saxon race, and America's great mission in the struggle with "world communism".

Very typical in this respect is an article by S. Possony, head of the International Affairs Department of the Hoover Institute, Stanford University. Discussing the social significance of anti-communist conservatism in connection with the development of the world revolutionary process, he directly states the fundamental hostility of modern bourgeois conservatism to social revolution. "The central contention of conservatism," he writes, "has been that, before building something new, the values that have been created must be conserved."[2] He goes on to say that in the United States, the foremost conservative commitment is to defend and improve "the social and economic institutions on which our civilisation is built."[3] Possony holds that these institutions may be improved by certain limited social changes and reforms, but never, on any account, by revolution.

There is, of course, nothing new in this attitude. Auguste Comte, the father of positivism, and Herbert Spencer, both writing in the 19th century, advocated "smooth evolution", progress through reforms as opposed to revolution. Many trends of contemporary bourgeois sociology have rejected the concept

---

[1] Clinton Rossiter, op. cit., p. 16.

[2] S. Possony, "The Challenge of Crisis. Preliminary Thought on a Conservative Defense Doctrine", *What Is Conservatism?*, Ed. by F. S. Meyer, New York, 1964, p. 190.

[3] Ibid., p. 190.

of progress altogether, replacing it with the abstract, empty concept of social change, dispensing with all views of consistent development by stages, the progressive movement of society, and refusing to recognise qualitatively different stages of human history.

This, then, is Possony's standpoint. He is for conserving the economic, social and political institutions of the capitalist system, allowing limited social changes (reforms) within the framework of this outdated, anti-popular order.

It is, of course, perfectly true that social progress involves the preservation and transmission of certain features and elements from one socio-economic formation to another. But each new stage in social development, as Marxist sociology has proved irrefutably, is marked by the "dismissal" or rejection of outdated, conservative features. It is indeed this fact that the conservatives in bourgeois sociology are intent upon driving out of the minds of the masses. The aim of conservatism is to perpetuate the basic social, economic and political institutions of the capitalist system. The conservatives' hostility to social progress determines their hostility to the world revolutionary process. It is no accident that they are so fond of referring to *The Reflections on the Revolution in France*, published by the ideologist of "classical conservatism" Burke (1790), citing it in support of their views.

The idea of the world revolutionary process, reflected in embryo form in the works of progressive French bourgeois thinkers of the 18th century, comprehensively analysed in Marxist-Leninist theory, and further developed in our time in various documents of creative Marxism, including the programme of the CPSU, absolutely infuriates the ideologists of contemporary conservatism.

Possony writes: "The American conservative is committed to defending the United States and its social order against the threat of Communism, including ... revolution...."[1] Further on he says: "If the United States wants to survive ... it must maintain a broadly superior military force financed by a substantial budget," and adds that "the present military budget of about sixty billion dollars is too low and sooner or later may have to be increased".[2]

However, social revolution is brought about not by exporting

---

[1] S. Possony, op. cit., p. 190.
[2] Ibid., p. 199.

it, by force imposed from without, but by the objective contradictions inherent in the capitalist system itself.

The successful development of the world socialist system does have a revolutionary catalysing influence on the workers of all countries, but this influence is that of the power of example and not that achieved through the use of force, by resorting to military means as Possony and other anti-communist conservatives would have people believe. The socialist system influences the world revolutionary process by demonstrating the advantages of socialism for all to see, by offering political and moral support to the movements for emancipation from social and national oppression.

Reactionary imperialist politicians and the conservative ideologists who express their views would very much like to interrupt the course of historical progress by forceful means, and use military force, including surprise attack, to overcome the superiority of the socialist system.

In *A Forward Strategy for America,* Possony and his co-authors insist that capitalism must be prepared to oppose socialism at "any level of force", and that in view of the growing power of socialism, the USA may find it necessary to "strike first".

Thus, neo-conservatism supplements the thesis of military force with the false premise that counter-revolutionary force is an inevitable factor of contemporary social relations in the sphere of international politics.

## The Doctrine of "Escalation" and Preaching of the Inevitability of Nuclear War

The various sociological theories on which power politics are based all have in common the basic premise that force is the decisive factor in international relations. Where they differ is over the point of whether they consider to be necessary unlimited use of force (up to and including world nuclear war) or its use on a limited (local) scale.

Yet all these doctrines of force meet with strong censure and opposition on the part of world public opinion. The former, i.e., those in favour of resorting to world nuclear war, are strongly criticised not only by Marxists and progressives, but

by many sober-minded bourgeois politicians too. There has also been an increasing amount of criticism in bourgeois sociological literature over the past few years of the concept of "limited" use of force, and especially that of "local wars".

Many bourgeois sociologists quite rightly point out that the fundamental weakness of this idea is that it is extremely difficult, indeed, practically impossible, to determine where the borderline lies between "limited" and "unlimited" use of force. In the present international situation, a local war is always liable to develop into a nuclear conflict on a world scale.[1]

However, there are some bourgeois sociologists who insist that the doctrine of "limited use of force" is not effective enough as a means of achieving the foreign policy aims of the reactionary imperialist groups whose interests they represent.

Typical of the latter attitude are the ideas P. Anderson presents in his book *Thermonuclear Warfare*. He regards "limited war" as a purely defensive measure, the idea being that "wherever aggression occurs", the West "should intervene, directly or indirectly, with as much force as is necessary to stop it, and no more". He regards this concept as "important" but "not enough" as "it is essentially defensive, and defensive psychology never won any wars".[2] He therefore insists that America should abandon "a policy of containment in favor of a policy of initiative".[3]

This "policy of initiative" involves maintaining "a large standing armed force equipped to fight any kind of war, conventional or otherwise",[4] since he sees no dividing line at which limited war becomes total, any more than he does between a limited conventional war and a limited atomic war. Moreover, he holds that, undesirable though a nuclear war may be, the longer it is postponed, the worse it will be: "A total war today would presumably not destroy mankind, a total war in fifteen or twenty years might do so."[5]

While urging that America should go all out to prepare for the event of a total nuclear war, Anderson considers she should also be prepared for limited wars, including a "limited atomic war" which he considers to be likely in the near future.

[1] Morton H. Halperin, *Limited War in the Nuclear Age*, London, 1963, p. 17.

[2] Paul Anderson, *Thermonuclear Warfare*, Derby, Connecticut, 1963, p. 127.

[3] Ibid., p. 151-52.

[4] Ibid., p. 151.

[5] Ibid., p. 152.

Thus, Anderson's attitude represents a typical combination of the concepts of "limited" and "unlimited" use of force, a view expressed particularly clearly in the doctrine of "escalation". This doctrine, advanced by the American military strategist and sociologist H. Kahn, director of the Hudson Institute, a research organisation that analyses international affairs for the Pentagon, has become extremely current in the United States recently as a theoretical and practical basis for the policy of counter-revolutionary force.

The doctrine of "escalation" is an overtly aggressive principle of military strategy, which at the same time has certain philosophical and sociological aspects. It is founded on the premise that war is inevitable in the present age.

The main content of the doctrine of "escalation" is close analysis of the "continuous paths between a low-level crisis and an all-out war".[1] In other words, it is a well worked-out programme for gradually involving mankind in total nuclear war. "Strategies that emphasise the possibility of escalation", Kahn writes, "are associated with the term 'brinkmanship' ".[2] Kahn's metaphorical "ladder" has 44 rungs starting at the bottom with "the ostensible crisis stage", a war of speeches and declarations (rung 1), and finishing on the top rung with "spasms or insensate war", when "all the buttons are pressed" (rung 44).

On the first rung, Kahn writes, one side asserts that "unless a given dispute is resolved in the immediate future it will in effect begin to climb the rungs of the escalation ladder".

The next steps are "threatening acts" and "hardening of positions", when one can reassure one's own side by pointing out that the other side is not mad and will therefore back down; "show of force"; "significant mobilisation"; "harassing acts of violence": "bombs may be exploded", "frontier guards may be shot", sabotage and terrorisation, flights over enemy territory. Then comes the "dramatic military confrontation".

Next, following the "provocatory diplomatic break" (rung 10), and the "super-ready status", comes a "large conventional war". Now, Kahn continues, "the stage has been set for some kind of organised military violence". Three more rungs, and we arrive at the "barely nuclear war": either "a nuclear weapon is used unintentionally" or "one [?] of the antagonists may

---

[1] H. Kahn, " 'Escalation' as a Strategy", *Fortune*, April 1965, p. 110.
[2] Ibid.

make military or political use of a nuclear weapon and try to give the impression that its use was unintentional".

The remaining rungs are various stages of nuclear war. Thus, Kahn concludes, "the unthinkable all-out war is becoming thinkable" and "we cross the threshold".[1]

It is this view that contains the essence of Kahn's doctrine of "escalation": the inevitability of "crossing the threshold", the fatal way in which the possible becomes the actual.

Naturally, as long as imperialism and its aggressive circles exist, the possibility of war, including world nuclear war, can never be excluded. But in our time the necessary subjective and objective prerequisites for preventing the possible from coming about do exist. The most important of these are the existence of the world socialist system, the powerful upswing of the national liberation movement, the international peace movement, and the firm determination of peace-loving people everywhere not to let it happen.

The doctrine of escalation has another aspect with important social implications, and that is the way it obliterates the dividing line between local war and total nuclear war on a world scale. It serves to justify whatever form of military force is most to the advantage of United States monopoly capital at any particular juncture. Hence the insistence on the possibility of local nuclear wars which can "escalate" to an all-out nuclear war that is characteristic of the ideas of H. Kahn and other supporters of his theory.[2] Synthesis of the "limited" and "unlimited" use of military violence in foreign policy, depending on circumstances, is a major sociological aspect of the escalation doctrine.

The doctrine of escalation represents an attempt to put pressure on opponents of American imperialism, and blackmail them. In this respect, it is similar to another socio-political theory of American militarism, Thomas Schelling's theory of political blackmail. The theory is based on the premise that the scientific and technological revolution and general international development in the last few decades make it extremely dangerous to resort to all-out thermonuclear war for the defence of certain social interests. "War and the brink of war", Schel-

[1] Ibid., p. 112.

[2] Viz., Edward Teller who, insisting on how difficult it is to draw a line between local and all-out nuclear war, points out that "a limited nuclear conflict can escalate" (E. Teller, "The Uses of Nuclear Energy", *The Conservative Papers*, New York, 1964, p. 211).

ling writes, "are more a contest of nerve and risk-taking, of pain and endurance," while "military strategy, whether we like it or not, has become the diplomacy of violence".[1]

The central issue of the "diplomacy of violence" is manipulation of threats in such a way as to ensure the achievement of political demands at the price of risking nuclear war but not at the price of the war itself. The main thing is psychological deterrence, best achieved, in Schelling's opinion, by "limited" or "local" war.

He illustrates his theory with the following example. "If I say, 'Row, or I'll tip the boat over and drown us both', you'll not believe me. I cannot actually tip the boat over to make you row. But if I start rocking the boat so that it *may* tip over—not because I want it to but because I do not completely control things once I start rocking the boat—you'll be more impressed".[2]

Schelling applies the term "generator of risk" to this kind of local war. To wage a limited war, he writes, is to begin to rock the boat, to start off a process which is not entirely under our control, counting on the other side retreating before the danger of an all-out war.

The basic error of both of Schelling's theory of psychological deterrence and Kahn's theory of escalation is that they both derive from the fallacious voluntarist premise that the class will of the imperialist politicians can be imposed on the countries of the socialist community by means of gradual and limited use of military force or political blackmail.

In point of fact, class will is not a self-contained factor, but an intrinsic part of the whole sum of social and, above all, material conditions. History has shown that the class will of the imperialist bourgeoisie to the destruction of socialism comes up against insurmountable obstacles, and "power politics" suffer failure after failure.

* * *

This short review of the main trends of US bourgeois sociology involving attempts to provide theoretical justification for imperialist power politics leads us to the following conclusions.

First, modification of the traditional sociological theories of imperialist power politics is in the direction of their adaptation

---

[1] Thomas C. Schelling, *Arms and Influence*, No. 9, 1966, pp. 33, 34.
[2] Ibid., p. 91.

to new conditions in view of the bankruptcy of this policy, and the search for methods to camouflage imperialist aggression.

Second, representing as they do the interests of a reactionary class that is historically doomed—the imperialist bourgeoisie—supporters of aggressive sociological doctrines have not abandoned their support for adventurist efforts to change the course of social development and obstruct the triumph of socialism by force of arms, but have merely somewhat altered the outward appearance of their traditional theories.

Third, the modification and decline of the traditional imperialist doctrines of "power politics" has produced doubt and uncertainty in the minds of many bourgeois sociologists, causing them to think again, and in some cases even to protest against certain extremes of aggressive imperialist policy.

## Chapter XI

# THE THEORY OF GAMES IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The publication in 1944 of a book entitled *The Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour* by John von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern is generally taken as marking the birth of the "theory of games". It quickly found practical application in warfare, economics, the construction of electronic computers and cybernetics, and little over a decade later a UNESCO publication announced: "There is in the process of developing at the present time a radically different kind of mathematical model.... It is called the theory of games of strategy".[1] Since then the theory has taken its first independent steps. Two eminent specialists described it as "one of the first examples of an elaborate mathematical development centered solely in the social sciences".[2]

The term itself is not entirely satisfactory since it might suggest to the layman such specific pastimes as cards, chess and so on, depending on his own particular associations. In point of fact, however, this theory treats all conflicts of interests as games of strategy, and games as we usually understand them are only one kind of many as far as this theory is concerned. The theory of games is used for the purpose of analysing all

---

[1] *The Nature of Conflict. Studies on the Sociological Aspects of International Tensions*, UNESCO, Paris, 1957, p. 71.

[2] R. Duncan Luce and Howard Raiffa, *Games and Decisions*, New York, 1957, p. 11.

kinds of conflict, including politics in general and problems of war and peace in particular.

One may or may not agree with the usefulness of the theory, but it would be wrong to reject it out of hand, without examining the evidence carefully. Especially where so much is at stake —nothing more nor less than the future of mankind. No path which might lead to peace must be left unexplored, no stone left unturned that might lead to a solution of this vital issue.

Unfortunately, it was the militarists who were the first to turn their attention to the possibility of using the new theory in their own interests. This was largely due to the efforts of Morgenstern himself, though many others have contributed to it, including H. Kahn, T. Schelling, M. Halperin, H. Kissinger, B. Brodie, A. Wollstetter, K. Knorr, R. Osgood and D. Brennan. The great danger lies in the fact that neither the generals nor the public at large are in a position to test the validity of the deductions made by Kahn and his colleagues, who have been dubbed "the new civilian militarists" in the United States. Their deductions are being taken at their face value, on trust, because everyone is prepared to accept the theory itself, and these self-styled experts are thus left to draw the conclusions they wish to from it.

It was probably to them that Eisenhower was referring when, at the end of his term of office as president, he warned of the danger of national policy becoming the "captive of a scientific-technological elite". He was, of course, exaggerating somewhat, since the latter basically "takes the orders", but it is certainly a two-way process, since the "customer" depends to a certain extent on the advice of the experts. The influence of the "theory of games" experts has made itself clearly felt in the Pentagon, and it may well extend to the White House. I. Horowitz, a professor of sociology, warns of this danger in his book *The War Game*. He writes: "... the prophecies of the NCM [New Civilian Militarists—*The Author.*] may be realised not because they are based on scientifically accurate predictions, but simply as a consequence of the general acceptance of the definitions provided by game theorists."[1]

The "civilian militarists" naturally arouse the antipathy and condemnation of world public opinion. Here are a few examples of reactions to their writings. Charles Osgood, Professor of Psychology and Director of the Institute of Communications

[1] I. Horowitz, *The War Game*, New York, 1963, p. 23.

Research, University of Illinois, writes that Kahn's views represent "The final degradation of human intelligence".[1] R. Watson-Watt, the inventor of radar, criticised Kahn's inhuman arithmetical approach to the question of nuclear war.[2]

Such indignation is fully justified and understandable, but is not enough in itself. The authors of these bloodthirsty works are quite indifferent to the moral indignation the unprejudiced reader is bound to feel. Thus, in *Thinking About the Unthinkable*, Kahn tries to shrug off the blame, and rejects the accusation that he is a warmonger. It is not a surgeon's fault, he argues, that he has to bloody his hands. One cannot, like the rulers of old, punish a messenger who brings bad news. All he is doing is to study some aspects of the tragedy of mankind from the quantitative angle.

The supporters of peace do not always find it easy to expose the militarist who has donned the mantle of omniscience, and dared to think of the unthinkable. The latter insists that science is impartial, that he is merely offering strategical advice for achieving a pre-set aim, and that it is not his job to draw ethical conclusions. The advocates of peace are made to look like poor fools who are hopelessly out of step with the times, and the strategists like heroes who have the courage to look the Medusa of war straight in the face without being turned to stone. As H. S. Hughes, Harvard University professor, put it, "the advocates of peace and disarmament will never be taken seriously until they can meet and answer the authority of a Herman Kahn".[3] The only way to fight the strategist scholars is to put the ball squarely in their court.

The following is a brief outline of the theory of games, just enough to enable the reader to gain a general idea. No attempt is made to go into the mathematical side of the theory.

According to the theory of games, all conflicts and disputes are divided into two categories: games that are strictly competitive and games that are not strictly competitive. In the former case, the interests of the two sides are diametrically opposed and irreconcilable, and victory for one side means defeat for the other. The principle is much the same as in cards or wrestling. A victory means that a side is one point up, a

---

[1] Charles E. Osgood, "Reciprocal Initiative", *The Liberal Papers*, Chicago, 1962, p. 165.

[2] R. Watson-Watt, *Man's Means to His End*, New York, 1961.

[3] H. S. Hughes, *An Approach to Peace*, New York, 1962, p. 62.

defeat that it is one point down. A victory followed by a defeat for a side brings its score to nil, hence the term "zero-sum games" often applies to this category.

In the case of games that are not strictly competitive, the interests of the two sides conflict without being diametrically opposed. There is plenty of leeway for compromise, mutual concessions and even co-operation. This kind of situation is to be observed in family life or international relations. The score is not so easily determined as in games of the first category, hence the term "non-zero-sum games".

The two sides are able to choose their own course of action, it being assumed that they will choose the course most likely to lead to victory. In deciding upon a course of action it is necessary to take into account the intentions of the adversary, who is assumed to be no less intelligent than yourself. All the possible courses of action represent a set of strategies. The combination of strategies—for example, strategy No. 1 for blue, and strategy No. 4 for red—produce a possible result. These possible results can be represented by a chart called the payments matrix, the gains of one side and the losses of the other being entered in the squares and termed payments. Thus, in the square where blue's strategy 1 intersects red's strategy 4 plus one is entered, representing a win for blue and a loss for red. It is important to have a clear idea of exactly what payments are involved in a given conflict. In politics the lives of thousands and millions of people may depend on it.

The theory of games does not represent a purely utilitarian discovery of the means of solving a conflict in favour of the side that knows the theory better. Indeed, practice has often shown the opposite to be the case—that there are no easy ways to victory. Just as spectacles correct bad sight, the theory of games helps see a situation and the ways of resolving it better. But if glasses are to be of any use at all, they have to be the correct strength, corresponding to the defect. Similarly, game theory can only be effective if the "model of the game" is appropriate to the nature of the conflict. Often the best moves for a zero-sum game are not only different from but quite the opposite of what would be best in a non-zero-sum game. An increase in the number of players above two also fundamentally alters the situation, since it then becomes possible to form alliances, two against one, and so on.

The theory of games has only been well elaborated for one class of games, two-person zero-sum games. But that is not a

very common situation in international relations. If we approach international affairs from the point of view of the first class of games, and not the other more complex ones, there is the danger of producing false recommendations, all the more dangerous for the fact that the process by which they were reached has the appearance of being scientific. Since these recommendations generally correspond to the deductions of the most reactionary and militarist circles, it is extremely important that they be exposed as invalid.

The intellectuals in the service of American militarism are represented above all by the staff of the Rand Corporation, which is almost entirely engaged on various work for the US Air Force.

Professor Morgenstern of Princeton University is one of those to whom this might well apply. In an article entitled "The Cold War Is Cold Poker" which appeared in *The New York Times Sunday Supplement* he makes abuses of his great authority to liken US-Soviet relations to a zero-sum game. Since poker is an example of the latter he urges that American diplomacy would do well to take a leaf out of the book of an expert card player. "Although the situations are not completely identical in poker and the cold war, they are similar enough so that something substantial can be learned from good poker principles."[1]

Morgenstern had expounded this theory in more detail in his book *The Question of National Defense.* Here he insists that in international poker, the problem of what is "best" for each side "cannot be solved by merely using the common-sense approach of military academies. This is the domain of the mathematical theory of games of strategy...."[2] It is with declarations of this sort that Morgenstern and his followers try to produce firm scientific justification of the aggressive policies of American imperialism. By their own paths, of which the layman remains ignorant, these experts reach the most banal conclusions of the most hardened reactionaries.

This happens because in a zero-sum game the sides usually have to make an "all or nothing" choice, so that they tend to act according to the principle of "win or bust". Undoubtedly, this kind of thinking in terms of victory or defeat has a strong

---

[1] *The New York Times Magazine*, February 5, 1961, p. 21.

[2] O. Morgenstern, *The Question of National Defense*, New York, 1959, p. 164.

appeal for the reactionary military in the service of monopoly capital. The conclusions of the game theory specialists suit them perfectly and they welcome them with open arms. This kind of thinking also fits in with the widespread attitude in the United States which N. Wiener, the father of cybernetics, described as "the tendency ... to regard a war in the light of a glorified football game, at which at some period the final score is in, and which we have to count as either a definite victory or a definite defeat".[1] The apparently scientific nature of these theories can also have a strong appeal for young officers with a technological background. The British journalist Paul Johnson wrote that "the impact of pseudo-scientific doctrines on these men, whose moral reflexes have been blunted by the exigencies of the cold war, can be disastrous".[2]

There is certainly a danger of game theory infused with the cold war spirit blocking all paths to resolution of the conflict between the two socio-economic systems apart from a direct military clash. This dangerous combination is to be found in the attitude of the American "ultras", including the republican candidate defeated in the 1964 presidential elections, Barry Goldwater. "For him," Walter Lippmann wrote, "all conflicts and disputes must end either in victory or defeat."[3] In the language of game theory, the ultras regard international relations as a zero-sum game. It is hardly surprising that they should widely advertise the conclusions of Kahn and other "strategists", for "a two-person zero-sum game is a game between two players in which their interests are diametrically opposed: one player gains only at the expense of the other. Consequently, there is no motive for collusion between the players."[4]

It is easy to see how treating international relations, or at least relations between the capitalist and socialist countries, as a zero-sum game entails rejection of the principles of international law and excludes the possibility of peaceful coexistence, by removing all bases for agreement.

What we have here is a shameless distortion of scientific principles, the attempt to apply the logic of zero-sum games to

---

[1] N. Wiener, *I Am a Mathematician. The Later Life of a Prodigy*, New York, 1956, p. 299.

[2] *New Statesman*, May 12, 1961, p. 754.

[3] *New York Herald Tribune*, March 3, 1964.

[4] D. Blackwell, M. A. Girshick, *Theory of Games and Statistical Decisions*, New York, 1954, pp. 9-10.

non-zero-sum conflicts, which require a completely different, often completely opposite, set of rules.

Let us take a look at an example given by Professor Rapoport of Michigan University—the example of the conflict in Puccini's opera *La Tosca*. The police chief Scarpia promises Tosca he will spare Cavaradossi's life in return for her favours. But both decide to double-cross the other: Tosca kills Scarpia, who has not in fact given the order to have the firing squad's bullets replaced with blanks.

According to game theory, the situation is as follows. Tosca can save Cavaradossi's life, but at an extremely high price. If she can trick Scarpia, and thereby save Cavaradossi without paying the price requested, she will save herself from dishonour. She thus chooses the strategy of double-cross. Scarpia looks at it like this: he can get what he wants from Tosca, but at the high price of sparing his rival. But if he double-crosses Tosca and she keeps her word, he will have got what he wants from Tosca and Cavaradossi will have been put out of the way into the bargain. He therefore chooses the strategy of double-cross. Both choose to double-cross and both lose. Why?

The mistake is that both Scarpia and Tosca viewed the situation as a zero-sum game, and chose their strategy accordingly. In actual fact, however, the situation was not at all that of a zero-sum game, and both would have done better to have kept their word, however difficult it might have been. Both would then have achieved their main, though not their maximum objective.

Here is what Rapoport has to say on the subject. "I have seen many research proposals and listened to long discussions of how hot and cold wars can be 'gamed'.... By far the most important conflicts that plague the human race do not fit into the two-person zero-sum category at all.... No argument addressed individually to Tosca or to Scarpia will convince either that it is better to keep the bargain than to double-cross the other. Only an argument addressed to both at once has this force. Only collective rationality will help them to avoid the trap of the double double-cross.... At times we must learn the meaning of trust, or else both we and our opponents will invariably lose in games of the Tosca-Scarpia type."[1]

Let us examine another version of the same game. Suppose

[1] "The Use and Misuse of Game Theory", *Scientific American*, Dec. 1962, p. 118.

two countries have concluded an agreement on disarmament measures. They are both at liberty to choose either of two courses: the strategy of honouring the agreement or the strategy of breaking it. If side 1 breaks the agreement, and side 2 honours it, side 1 gains a considerable advantage. If, on the other hand, it honours the agreement, it stands to lose a lot should side 2 decide to break it. Both sides will reason this out in the same way. Arguments addressed to the zero-sum category by both sides dictate the strategy of double-cross to both sides. Yet both sides will lose by this double double-cross, since the arms race would be on again, although it is in the interest of both sides to stop it.

These examples should suffice to show how mistaken it is to treat international political relations as belonging to the zero-sum category. As Professor Fisher of Harvard University so aptly put it, "the world is not a zero-sum game".[1] The same view is expressed in another major work on game theory: "The strict conflict of interests is a realistic assumption for parlor games and military operations, and for a few special situations in business.... Outside of this rather limited domain, one is hard pressed to come up with a truly realistic game problem."[2]

Meanwhile, the strategists of the Rand Corporation, not to mention the Pentagon strategists, persist in regarding US-Soviet relations as a zero-sum game. Thus, Morgenstern for one, adopts the basic premise that "the opponent's interests are clearly opposed to our own", and makes this an excuse for the most aggressive recommendations.

Generally speaking, imperialist policies can be regarded as being based on the concept of deterrence, which the French general Beaufre described as the "hidden mainspring of our age". The theory of deterrence rests on the same assumptions as a zero-sum game. Rapoport has the following to say in this connection: "The theory of deterrence rests squarely on the assumption that the all-consuming passion of the Enemy is to destroy us and that only the realisation of his own vulnerability prevents him from doing so.... The zero-sum-game assumption is most pronounced in the fact that we attribute to the *other* preferences for those courses of action which are most

---

[1] *Fractionating Conflict. International Conflict and Behavioral Science.* The Craigrille Papers, Roger Fisher, Editor, New York, 1964, p. 109.

[2] Samuel Karlin, *Mathematical Methods and Theories in Games, Programming and Economics*, London, 1959, p. 7.

devastating to ourselves. The fact that the other does not as a rule carry those actions out is attributed almost exclusively to the effectiveness of deterrence".[1] The absence of a control experiment permits this line of reasoning to turn in a vicious circle of self-justification.

Many sober-minded people in the USA urge the development of wider spheres of co-operation, or what they call "the common interests of the opponents". One attempt to find such interests is a book by V. P. Rock of the Institute of Defence Research, in which the author calls for "a whole variety of 'non-zero games' ".[2] He mentions in particular joint research programmes, cultural exchanges, increased trade, and a disarmament agreement.

Political struggle and social progress are only possible in the context of peace, in the absence of nuclear war. Albert Einstein expressed this idea when he wrote: "Man must first ensure his survival; only then can he ask himself what type of existence he prefers."[3]

The importance of peace is also something that emerges perfectly clearly from the theory of games. Many leading scholars and scientists insist that the pay-offs must be carefully calculated in a game. How much is international peace worth? The price of a world nuclear war is so high, and would cause colossal damage to both national interests and the interests of mankind as a whole, representing a loss vastly in excess of any possible hoped-for gain. As J. Williams points out, "an obvious difficulty, which the user of Game Theory must learn to live with, has to do with the need to measure things which do not afford secure basis for measurement".[4] This remark is especially applicable to international relations.

The theory of games is concerned with quantitative values. Can victory in a nuclear war really be measured in quantitative terms? Morgenstern, Kahn, Teller and others who consider nuclear war "thinkable" hold that it can. They write that by building nuclear shelters American casualties in a nuclear war

---

[1] A. Rapoport, *Strategy and Conscience*, pp. 106-07.

[2] Vincent P. Rock, *A Strategy of Interdependence. A Program for the Control of Conflict Between the United States and the Soviet Union*, New York, 1964, p. 40.

[3] *Einstein on Peace*, Ed. by O. Nathan and H. Norden, New York, 1968, p. 468.

[4] J. D. Williams, *The Complete Strategist Being a Primer on the Theory of Games of Strategy*, New York-Toronto-London, 1954, p. 193.

could be reduced to an "acceptable" level of 50 to 80 million. But if we forget the mathematics for a moment and view the matter in human terms, is there really any sense in aiming for such a Pyrrhic victory? What does "getting 'wiped out' mean" in a thermonuclear war? asks the American sociologist A. Waskow. Would it not be far more useful to concentrate intellectual efforts, including the use of the mathematical apparatus of the theory of games, on finding peaceful means of resolving international conflicts? N. Wiener points out: "The only experience of a nuclear war which is not immediately catastrophic is the experience of the war game. If we are to use this experience as a guide for our procedure in a real emergency, the values of winning which we have employed in programming games must be the same values which we hold at heart in the actual outcome of the war. We can fail in this only at our immediate, utter, and irretrievable peril."[1]

Many scientists and scholars in America who object strongly to the misuse of game theory by the militarists insist that the results of nuclear war cannot be reckoned in quantitative terms. Thus, the physicist and publicist R. Lapp writes: "Let us try to imagine a two-player nuclear game between the United States and the Soviet Union. Some of our mathematical analysts have become fascinated with the results of their calculus. Their computers tell them that, under certain circumstances, we could score a 'win' in a nuclear war. Unhappily, the computer arrives at this result only because it has no feelings: it grinds out answers with complete unconcern.... If Country A loses 30 million dead and 27 per cent of its economy, whereas Country B has 90 million dead and 68 per cent of its economy destroyed, the computer pronounces Country A the winner. One wonders how much consolation that would be to Country A."[2]

Retired Rear Admiral Eccles expresses a similar view: "While in many tactical encounters and in some strategic situations it is possible to win, in most major international crises the popular connotation of 'winning' may be both false and harmful to our thinking."[3]

The "civilian strategist" thesis that nuclear war is admissible

---

[1] N. Wiener, *Cybernetics or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*, New York-London, 1961, p. 177.

[2] R. Lapp, *Kill and Overkill. The Strategy of Annihilation*, New York, 1962, pp. 94, 95, 96.

[3] H. Eccles, *Military Concepts and Philosophy*, New Brunswick, 1965, p. 58.

represents a pseudo-scientific treatment of political issues, juggling with abstractions and imaginary situations bearing little relation to reality.

This kind of thinking is typical of practically all theorising based on game theory. Whole series of imaginary events and stratagems are devised, while those aspects of game theory that cannot be reconciled are conveniently forgotten. Thus, one of the essential premises of game theory, the assumption of the players' intelligence, is completely ignored by Kahn and company. The Hudson Institute of which he is director is responsible for devising all sorts of games based on irrational assumptions that game theory just does not admit.

Similar imaginary situations are examined in the book *Limited Strategic War*. One of the games is as follows: country A destroys one of country B's towns and B retaliates by destroying two of A's towns. A is faced with the dilemma of whether to carry on the "exchange" or climb down. Suppose A decides on limited strategic war. Then B is faced with the same problem, and so on. The authors have the grace to remark that "the world of limited strategic war is very strange", and "the reader may be left wondering what relevance, if any, these notions have to the real world". Yet it is entirely to this "strange world" that the work so highly paid by the Rand Corporation is devoted.

We find the same kind of irrelevant thinking in the last book by the late J. Strachey, a British Labour theoretician. "It is improbable that Russia will set out to conquer the world by military means.... But improbable events sometimes happen. And think of what would be at stake if this improbable event *did* happen?"[1]

One is rather at a loss for an answer when faced with such intellectual pathology. Erich Fromm is right on the mark when he writes: "Most Americans today think about Russia in a paranoid fashion; namely, they ask what is *possible* rather than what is *probable*.... If we think only of *possibilities*, then indeed there is no chance for realistic and sensible political action."[2] The method of going through all the possible moves and courses of action employed by numerous American supporters of game theory leads to just this kind of progressive political blindness.

[1] J. Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*, London, 1962, p. 101.

[2] E. Fromm, *May Man Prevail? An Inquiry Into the Facts and Fictions of Foreign Policy*, New York, 1961, pp. 20-21.

The "scientific" works of the nuclear strategists are characterised by their complete divorce from political life and total absorption in a narrow world of abstract pay-offs. R. Levine of the Rand Corporation tries to justify this on the grounds that "it is impossible in any meaningful way to show that any single policy is 'wrong' ".[1] The sides are at perfect liberty to choose their own "priorities", their own "hierarchy of values", and may base their actions on such principles as "better dead than Red". This of course can be the basis for a game with a suicidal outcome, but why this choice in the first place? Surely it would be far nearer the truth to say that the choice is between a sensible policy of peaceful coexistence and the highly dangerous policy of cold war.

A close look at the subject soon reveals the essential fallaciousness of the attempt to treat international politics as a zero-sum game, and it has been strongly criticised by many. The Americans R. D. Lewis, H. Raiffa, I. Horowitz and W. Mills, and the Englishman P. Blackett are among its many most virulent critics. It has come in for a great deal of criticism on the grounds that it takes no account of psychological factors. Professor Schelling of Harvard launched a "counter-attack" on critics of the theory in his book *The Strategy of Conflict*, in which he attempts to link game theory with psychology. He declares that the theory can also be called "a theory of interdependent decisions", and recommends the use of bluff, intimidation, blackmail and double-cross. Unfortunately, when he comes to international politics he devotes his intellectual powers to developing the theory of "power politics" rather than to the quest for ways of ensuring peace.

His dubious contribution in this field includes the idea of "coercive deficiency", and the theory that the strength of a threat does not depend on the damage it would cause to the one who carries it out. Schelling terms this the theory of skilful non-use of the armed forces. The threat is effective, he writes, in as far as the one who makes it shows that he will not be able to refrain from carrying it out should the threat itself fail to work.

People often resort to "coercive deficiency". In such cases they say they have "burnt their boats". The smoker who has decided to give up this harmful habit, intentionally leaves his cigarettes at home when he goes off fishing, so that whether

[1] Robert A. Levine, *The Arms Debate*, Cambridge, 1963, p. 9.

he wants to or not he will be unable to smoke. Or to take an example from international politics: during the so-called Berlin crisis in 1961, the United States moved more troops into Western Europe. The threat implied was: since the troops have been transferred, in "an emergency situation" it may prove necessary to use them whether we want to or not.

Schelling writes: "Game theory adds more insight into the strategy of bargaining by emphasising the striking truth that the threat does *not* depend on the threatener's having less to suffer than the threatened party.... Threats of war ... threats to make a 'scene' ... cannot be understood except by denying the utility-comparison criterion."[1] Thus, a threat does not depend on the idea "You'll come off worse than me!" but rather on the thought: "I may come off worst, but you won't come off so well yourself." In this way it is possible to use the threat of nuclear war to blackmail one's opponent. The thing is to do so skilfully, making it quite plain that you are really quite prepared to cross the "nuclear threshold".

One of the ways of doing so is the "coercive deficiency" we have already mentioned. In simple terms, this involves breaking off all contacts with the opponent once the ultimatum has been delivered. Another way is reckless behaviour. Kahn has gone into this theory in great detail. He describes the game of "chicken" as an example. Two people drive their cars at top speed toward each other, straddling the white line down the centre of the road. The first to lose his nerve and swerve aside is "chicken", an object of contempt and scorn. Kahn goes on to say that "the game is a useful analogy because it brings out *some* aspects of international relations that are important.... The skilful player gets into the car quite drunk, throwing whiskey bottles out of the window to make it clear to everybody just how drunk he is. He wears very dark glasses so that it is obvious that he cannot see anything. As soon as the car reaches high speed, he takes the steering wheel and throws it out of the window."[2] The other driver sees there is nothing for it but to swerve.

This kind of theory of international blackmail is very much to the liking of the West German revanchists. They hope to

---

[1] Thomas C. Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict*, New York, 1963, p. 131.

[2] *National Security. Political, Military and Economic Strategies in the Decade Ahead*, New York, 1963, p. 523.

achieve their aims by playing "chicken" with nuclear weapons.

But surely the stakes are really too high? This brings us back to the question of "pay-offs", going beyond the limits of game theory.

Bertrand Russell considers: "The game may be played without misfortune a few times, but sooner or later it will come to be felt that loss of face is more dreadful than nuclear annihilation."[1] After which the world will be plunged into a disaster that possibly nobody wanted. The game of "chicken" is alright for playboys but it is criminal to recommend it as a principle of behaviour in international affairs.

Yet dangerous advice urging the use of international blackmail is to be heard more and more frequently. It is no exaggeration to speak of a flood of literature of this kind, "theoretical" material reflecting the growing role of the Pentagon in American foreign policy. Thus Horelick and Rush of the Rand Corporation accuse the White House of "excessive restraint" in the "political employment of strategic nuclear threats",[2] while Bernard Brodie objects to the "timidity" of the American Government.[3] Schelling rebukes several of his colleagues for paying too much attention to "deterrence" and not enough to "constraint", and suggests the US Defence Department ought to be renamed the Department of Attack.[4]

* * *

It remains to be seen how successfully the theory of games can be applied to international politics in general, and to matters of war and peace in particular. So far the theory is simply not ready for use in international affairs.

The formalisation of a conflict situation that its treatment in terms of game theory entails cuts two ways. It can be useful if it serves to free a conflict from secondary details and suggests ways of resolving it. But it can also lead one away from important, and even basic details, so that the main essence of the conflict is completely lost in the game model. As Professor Boulding of Michigan University grudgingly admits, "it is perhaps true at the moment that game theory operates at a level of

---

[1] B. Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*, London, 1959, p. 30.

[2] A. Horelick, M. Rush, *Strategic Power and Soviet Foreign Policy*, Chicago, 1966, p. 10.

[3] Bernard Brodie, *Escalation and the Nuclear Option*, Princeton, 1966.

[4] Thomas C. Schelling, *Arms and Influence*, New Haven-London, 1966.

abstraction that is a little too high to be immediately fruitful in practical conclusions".[1]

The main difficulty involved in applying game theory to international situations is that so much remains to be clarified before any definite conclusions can be drawn—this particularly applies to the question of pay-offs, which often in practice cannot be assessed in quantitative terms (how much is the high morale of a people fighting for its freedom worth?)—and also the fact that it is impossible to take into account all the relevant political and moral factors.

The simpler the situation the greater the chance of game theory being successfully used. But international relations are extremely complicated. Many political problems can only with great difficulty, if at all, be translated into mathematical terms. If an algorithm could be found for political problems, it would be possible to programme electronic computers accordingly, and leave them to find the answers, and thus dispense with the services of generals and diplomats. But, for the time being at any rate, such an "electronic death" does not even threaten chess, which is simpler than politics.

However, the present shortcomings of game theory should not be used as grounds for out-of-hand rejection or sweeping criticism of the whole theory—however great the temptation might be in view of the use made of it to justify aggressive policies. In other words, the deliberate abstraction from major political, social and class factors that imperialist ideologists find necessary for pseudo-scientific justification of their aggressive policies should not provoke the supporters of peace to ignore game theory as just another reactionary device. Game theory itself, as a mathematical method of analysis, is perfectly neutral. Some of the ideas it suggests could prove useful in practice. We are bound to agree with A. Rapoport, one of the most virulent critics of militarist use being made of game theory, when he says that reference to this theory in itself may be useful since it "stimulates us to think about conflict in a novel way".[2] However, it is always necessary to bear in mind the dangers of getting carried away with this theory and the possibility of its being deliberately distorted.

---

[1] Kenneth E. Boulding, *Conflict and Defense. A General Theory*, New York, 1962, p. 57.

[2] A. Rapoport, *Fights, Games and Debates*, New York, 1960, p. 242.

## Chapter XII

# WHO IS OPPOSED TO PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

At the present time there is an increasingly evident and imperative need for energetic struggle against the reactionary aggressive forces which have already plunged mankind into two world wars and are now aggravating the situation.

The theories propagated by the ideologists of imperialism regarding the problem of war and peace and peaceful coexistence are extremely dangerous.

The principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems has acquired a vital importance for the whole of mankind, as the only reasonable alternative to nuclear war. Thus, acceptance or rejection of this principle serves as the basic criterion of attitudes to the whole problem of war and peace.

The most reactionary imperialist ideologists direct their efforts towards denying the possibility of peaceful coexistence, which is tantamount to assuming that a world military conflict between the imperialist camp and the socialist countries is inevitable. Yet even those who openly profess revanchist aims avoid making direct appeals for war.

The representatives of the most diverse ideological trends of West German imperialism are all continually stressing that West German interests are identical with those of the other European countries, insisting that the age of nation states is over, that national sovereignty is no longer necessary and is even harmful, that what is needed is a common European policy, that all Europe shares common traditions, a common heritage, and so on and so forth.

One of the most ardent preachers of the idea of European integration is the former defence minister of the FRG, Herr Strauss, who declared that "German policy is, and can only be, a function of European policy".[1]

Some West German imperialist ideologists even go so far as to maintain that not only renunciation of sovereignty and independence but the transformation of Western Europe into a single military camp is a condition for its very existence. They insist that renunciation of sovereignty is an absolute universal necessity in the present age, that it is the only way to ensure national security, along with the formation of large military blocs on a geographical basis.

But this is not all: reactionary ideologists are doing their utmost to discredit the principle of peaceful coexistence, inventing all sorts of "theoretical adductions" and "arguments" against the possibility of it working. The aim of this is to justify the aggressive policy of the revanchists, who have become the bastion of imperialist reaction on the continent of Europe.

Two main lines of approach can be distinguished in present attempts to refute the possibility of peaceful coexistence. One of them is to present a false picture of Marxist-Leninist doctrine, trying to show that it is incompatible with the idea of peaceful coexistence, and the other is to "prove" peaceful coexistence to be unrealistic in the present international situation.

The first includes the following two theses:

1) the thesis that peaceful coexistence contradicts the spirit and content of Marxism-Leninism, and is in particular incompatible with the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist revolution;

2) the thesis that the principle of peaceful coexistence is not an essential part of Soviet foreign policy, but merely a temporary tactical measure, designed to bring about the destruction of the capitalist system by political and ideological means without resorting to military conflict.

One of the arguments most frequently employed by the opponents of peaceful coexistence in the FRG is the fallacious theory of the incompatibility of the idea of peaceful coexistence with the principles of Marxism-Leninism. For instance, it is the *leitmotiff* of the book, *The Soviet Conception of Peaceful Coexistence*, by G. Wetter, a leading representative of clerical ideology. Posing as an impartial commentator on Marxism-Leninism, Wetter writes: "The policy of peaceful coexistence...

[1] *Aussenpolitik*, 1961, Heft 2, S. 79-80.

thus really means calmly waiting while one country after another, on the basis of a ripening process running its course as an objective necessity, 'falls away' from capitalism as dry leaves fall off a tree in autumn.... But it must be said that such a waiting attitude contradicts the inner nature of Leninism. For non-temporising and the urge to speed up the revolutionary process by military intervention was the point in which Lenin exerted a decisive influence on the development of Russian Marxism."[1]

On the basis of this interpretation of Marxism-Leninism, Wetter goes on to claim that "the thesis of peaceful coexistence can not only not be regarded as a logical conclusion from the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, but is rather contrary to some of the basic theses of this doctrine".[2]

Wetter is clearly tilting at windmills here, for he is attempting to defeat a concept of Marxism-Leninism that is purely the product of his own imagination. He commits at least two gross errors.

To start with, Marxism-Leninism has never likened the objective historical process of the ripening of socialist revolution in various capitalist countries to "dry leaves falling off trees". Such gross oversimplification of the development of social phenomena is quite alien to Marxism-Leninism. Moreover, such a passive, fatalistic waiting for historical events is not a feature of the revolutionary spirit of Marxism, especially in the case of events like social revolutions, which do not take place of their own accord, but with the active participation of the progressive social forces within the countries where conditions are already ripe for revolution. In speaking of the present age, the very fact of the existence of the world socialist system has a tremendous influence on the ripening and realisation of the revolutionary process in capitalist countries.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are a bulwark of the world revolutionary movement. Countries where a revolution is in progress, be it a socialist revolution or a national liberation revolution, can count on the moral and, where necessary, material support of the socialist countries. The economic and political achievements of the socialist countries serve as a powerful example to peoples who are struggling for fun-

[1] G. Wetter, *Die sowjetische Konzeption der Koexistenz*, Bonn, 1959. S. 22.

[2] Ibid., p. 31.

damental social transformations and national liberation, and give them confidence in the ultimate triumph of their just cause. Thanks to the achievements of the peoples of the USSR in the building of socialism and communism, "there exists in the world a socialist society that is a reality and a science of socialist construction that has been tested in practice. The highroad to socialism has been paved."[1]

In whatever part of the world a revolution is in progress, the world socialist system exerts a tremendous influence on its final outcome. This influence is manifested above all in the fact that imperialist reaction is unable to use force against a country in which a revolution is under way or has taken place, without risking counter-measures by the socialist countries.

But when Wetter writes of the urge of Marxism-Leninism to speed up the revolutionary process by forceful intervention, he means something quite different, and this is his second gross error. His standpoint in this matter is no different from the trivial attitude of the official anti-communist ideology of the imperialist countries, which views every socialist or national liberation revolution as a result of "world communist plots" and export of revolution. It is impossible to engage in a serious polemic with such views, since they represent a gross distortion of the revolutionary process.

Wetter sees his own false premise that socialist revolution is the product of outside influence as the chief obstacle to peaceful coexistence, and regards socialist revolution and peaceful coexistence as mutually exclusive. "The actual problem of coexistence," he writes, "is how it fits in with the communist aim of world revolution. Does the policy of coexistence mean renunciation of this aim? Or does it simply mean renunciation of achieving this aim by military means?"[2]

The foregoing is significant in two respects. Firstly, it shows that the ideologists of imperialism still question the historical inevitability of the emergence of socialism as a new economic and political system, and thus reject the inevitability of socialist revolution. Secondly, it shows the willingness of ruling circles in the imperialist states to accept the principle and policy of peaceful coexistence between the two systems only on condition that it guarantees the preservation of the bourgeois order in all the countries that are not yet socialist.

---

[1] *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, 1961, p. 463.
[2] G. Wetter, op. cit., S. 44.

In other words, in the first case imperialist ideologists are trying to "outlaw" socialist revolution, and in the second case imperialist ruling circles would have the Communists renounce their views, the class struggle and socialist revolution. Absurd though it is, imperialist ideologists only consider the policy of peaceful coexistence acceptable on these terms.[1]

In point of fact, however, the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence is in present conditions the only rational basis for preserving peace and the independence of all nations irrespective of their social and political system. The fundamental principles underlying peaceful coexistence as an objective necessity deriving from the existence of capitalism and socialism side by side in the world are set out in plain, unambiguous terms in the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. "*Peaceful coexistence* of the socialist and the capitalist countries is an *objective necessity* for the development of human society. *War cannot and must not serve as a means of settling international disputes.* Peaceful coexistence or disastrous war—such is the alternative offered by history."[2]

The Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in 1969 emphasised the inseparable link between the policy of peaceful coexistence and the struggle to preserve peace and prevent a new world war, and stressed the need for the peoples of the world to struggle for the triumph of the principles of peaceful coexistence in relations between countries with different social systems.

Obviously, Communists cannot, and do not intend to give the capitalists any guarantees that socialist revolution will not take place in their countries in due course, any guarantees of the perpetuation of the capitalist system. The history of human society, and especially the present age, render such hopes and demands of bourgeois ideologists pure utopian illusion.

Peaceful coexistence is the basis for peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism on an international scale, and is a form of class struggle between them. The principle of peaceful coexistence involves coexistence not between antagonistic classes, but between states, which despite their different class nature are equal subjects of international law and international relations.

The Moscow International Meeting of Communist and

---

[1] Ibid., S. 45.

[2] *The Road to Communism*, p. 506.

Workers' Parties (1959) expressed in clear and unambiguous terms the significance of peaceful coexistence as the essential condition for mobilising the forces of peace, socialism and progress for the historical offensive against the forces of imperialism and reaction. The clear, unequivocal statements contained in Documents of the Meeting render perfectly groundless all idle speculation and attempts to distort the class content of the principle of coexistence emanating from ideologists of imperialism and adventuristic ultra-Left groups.

Here is an extract from the Documents of the Meeting by way of illustration. "This policy [i.e., peaceful coexistence.—*The Author.*] does not imply either the preservation of the socio-political status quo or a weakening of the ideological struggle. It helps to promote the class struggle against imperialism on a national and world-wide scale. Determined class struggle for the abolition of the monopolies and their rule, for the institution of a genuinely democratic system, and for the establishment of socialist power, whatever may be the road leading to this goal, is an inalienable right and duty of the working people and their Communist Parties in the capitalist countries. The Communists of the world are in solidarity with this just battle."[1]

The principles of peaceful coexistence on no account involve forceful interference by the socialist countries in the internal affairs of the capitalist countries. Socialist revolution, the preconditions for which mature as part of the natural historical process, is quite incompatible, by virtue of its social, economic and political nature, with any form of outside interference, "pushing" or artificial hastening of revolutionary events. As Engels pointed out, "the Communists know only too well... that revolutions are not made deliberately and arbitrarily, but that everywhere and at all times they were the essential outcome of circumstances quite independent of the will and the leadership of particular parties and entire classes".[2] Lenin, too, frequently repeated this point, insisting that "Marxism has always been opposed to 'pushing' revolutions", and that "it is impossible to hasten something for which the historical conditions are not yet mature".[3]

---

[1] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, Prague, 1969, p. 31.

[2] K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, p. 89.

[3] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 110.

In this connection it should be noted that it has been the capitalist countries who have recently stepped up their subversive activities against the socialist countries with the aim of restoring capitalism there and upsetting the political balance in Europe.

All these factors show the claims of bourgeois ideologists that the principle of peaceful coexistence is incompatible with the theory of socialist revolution to be unwarranted. Both the simultaneous existence of socialism and capitalism in the world and socialist revolutions, whereby the transition of society to a higher stage of development is affected, represent objective laws of history, completely independent of subjective judgement.

On the basis of a thesis of their own invention, namely that peaceful coexistence is incompatible with Marxist-Leninist principles in general and the theory of socialist revolution in particular, bourgeois ideologists represent peaceful coexistence as a deliberate, treacherous tactic designed to destroy the capitalist system using all and any means other than thermonuclear war. This attitude is extremely common in bourgeois writings. It runs like a scarlet thread through *German Foreign Policy in the Post-War Period* by W. Grewe, one-time West German ambassador to the United States. Grewe writes: "The fact that the expression 'World Revolution' is to be met less frequently in the Soviet vocabulary nowadays, has changed nothing in the repeatedly stated determination to spread communism by means of cunning, deception, intimidation and if necessary even by force and establish it throughout the world as the universal system."[1]

Similar interpretations of peaceful coexistence are current in bourgeois ideology in other countries apart from the Federal Republic. Thus, the well-known US military theoretician Kissinger writes: "Peaceful coexistence has been justified by the Soviet leaders as the most efficient offensive tactic, as the best means to subvert the existing structure by means other than all-out war."[2]

This highly distorted view of peaceful coexistence, the invention of certain bourgeois ideologists, would not even deserve

---

[1] W. G. Grewe, *Deutsche Aussenpolitik der Nachkriegszeit*, Stuttgart, 1960, p. 447.

[2] Henry A. Kissinger, *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy*, New York, 1957, pp. 142-43.

our attention, were it not for the far-reaching practical deductions that are made from it, which have a direct bearing on imperialist policy towards the socialist community.

Some of the more consistent bourgeois ideologists reject the feasibility of peaceful coexistence, and identify it with cold war which could be "hotted up" at any moment. Thus T. Oberländer, an ex-nazi, declares: "There is no coexistence between the Free World and the Unfree World", but rather "cold or psychological war", which is a "means of the World Civil War in which we now find ourselves".[1]

But probably no one has gone further in the attempt to identify peaceful coexistence with cold war than the well-known veteran of West German imperialist ideology H. Rauschning in his book bearing the pretentious and intriguing title *Is Peace Still Possible*?. Rauschning wrote: "Soviet policy is nothing but permanent war against the capitalist states, a war in which military means are employed whenever the situation demands it.... The policy of the Soviet state towards the not yet communist world is war."[2] This represents the ultimate logic of the concept of peaceful coexistence as a tactic designed to bring about the destruction of capitalism by all possible means.

It is interesting to note how representatives of the most various trends of present-day bourgeois ideology, whatever their views, are practically unanimous in admitting that the Soviet Union has no intention of beginning a world war. This is a big departure from the views current in the first post-war years. It shows how in view of the actual facts of Soviet foreign policy directed towards consolidating universal peace, the official doctrine of imperialism has had to retreat from some of its more "orthodox" positions.

In the light of the facts, any attempts to present Soviet foreign policy as being directed towards starting a world war, simply fail to convince. Hence the "revised" thesis advanced by bourgeois ideologists attempting to prove the impossibility of peaceful coexistence—namely that the Soviet Union intends to destroy world capitalism by any means other than world war. Rather than attempt to actually disprove the impossibility of coexistence, the bourgeois opponents of the principle generally limit themselves to flagrant abuse and standard accusations in the worst traditions of the gutter press.

---

[1] *Der Stahlhelm*, 1962, N. 2.

[2] H. Rauschning, *Ist Friede noch möglich?*, Heidelberg, 1953, S. 113.

The quite unfounded accusations that for the Communists peaceful coexistence is a "treacherous tactic" designed to bring about the destruction of the capitalist system by all forceful means apart from world war is refuted not only by theoretical arguments but also by the actual facts in which the theory and politics of the Marxist-Leninist parties are embodied, which show that the Soviet Union does not merely pay lip service to the policy of coexistence but consistently implements it.

The idea is current in present-day bourgeois political and philosophical literature that peaceful coexistence is only possible between states with similar socio-political systems. This idea is usually presented not as an independent argument but as a supplement to the arguments examined above. In view of the fact that at the present time this is not the case since there exist two opposed systems, some bourgeois ideologists propose that in the interests of "peace and calm", the two systems should be completely isolated from one another. Thus, Karl Jaspers wrote in his book, *The Atom Bomb and Man's Future*: "Coexistence as a state of calm and peace is impossible unless both sides are completely isolated from each other."[1]

Jaspers reaches this conclusion on the basis of his own arbitrary division of the present-day world into "the world of freedom" and the "world of totalitarianism", which he regards as excluding all possibility of peace and coexistence. This dichotomy of his own creation leads him to the alternative of "freedom or the atom bomb", and since the world cannot be built on the ideals of freedom and truth acceptable to Jaspers, he is left with only one path, that of nuclear war. "In order not to lose man's freedom," he writes, "we must not conceal the possibility of there arising at some particular moment the necessity for a decision to be taken: 'the totalitarian state or the atom bomb' ".[2]

True, towards the end of his life, Jaspers' views underwent a considerable evolution towards realisation of the danger of the aggressive, extremist policy conducted by West German ruling groups. Thus, in one of his latter works, *Where Is the German Federal Republic Heading?* (1966), Jaspers strongly criticised the undemocratic, revanchist policy of reactionaries in

---

[1] K. Jaspers, *Die Atombombe und die Zukunft des Menschen*, München, 1958, S. 151.

[2] Ibid., p. 107.

the FRG, protested against the rehabilitation of war criminals and the passing of emergency laws, and expressed wholehearted support for the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

Nevertheless, whatever his own sentiments may have been, the objective logic of the philosophical conceptions he advanced in several of his major post-war works, in particular in *The Atom Bomb and Man's Future*, serve the interests of revanchist circles of West German imperialism.

The various arguments against peaceful coexistence are deliberately employed by the revanchist press in the FRG for the purpose of "proving" the inevitability of a military conflict between the two systems and justifying NATO military preparations. As the militarist paper *Der Stahlhelm* solemnly declares, "peace and friendship only exist between free peoples". It should be pointed out that these arguments are based on a fundamental flaw of a logical nature.

The concept of "coexistence", applied to social relations, implies the existence of opposite or at least different social phenomena. With regard to social phenomena of the same order, the question of coexistence does not arise.

Actually, of course, far more than logic is involved here. The Soviet Union does not only exist alongside the capitalist countries but has considerable economic, political and cultural ties with them. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are members of the UN (comprising countries irrespective of their social and political order) and many other international organisations. During the Second World War, the Soviet Union was a member of, and the decisive force in an alliance of states with different social and political systems. All this provides ample proof that the mere fact of countries having a different social and political system does not inevitably engender war.

A particularly widespread argument against peaceful coexistence is the thesis that in the process of competition between the two systems the capitalist countries are at a disadvantage in that they have political parties actively opposing the bourgeois order, whereas there are no anti-socialist parties in the socialist countries. This is the line taken by A. Buchholz in his book *The Struggle for a Better World*, in which he writes: "The problem begins with the fact that communism has considerably more opportunities for exerting influence in the West than the West has in the communist area. In view of its system of parliamentary freedom the West is wide open to communist influence while in the opposite direction all Western influences

are hermetically sealed off. Communism has parties in almost every country in the world at its disposal, while in the communist area not a single party is to be met with a 'Western' orientation."[1] From this Buchholz draws the conclusion that "peaceful competition between East and West is basically a one-sided way to the advance of communism".[2]

Buchholz is thus really side-stepping the issue, since the presence or absence of parties hostile to the existing system in any country bears no direct relation to the problem of peaceful coexistence, but is simply a question concerning the nature and social features of the two systems. It is not the specific nature of the two systems but the principles which determine their external relations with each other that have the decisive significance for the problem of peaceful coexistence.

The existence in capitalist countries of social forces struggling for the overthrow of capitalism merely shows that the system is not viable and is an argument in favour of replacing it with socialism. The instability of capitalism in face of the unity and solidarity of the socialist system is not an obstacle to peaceful coexistence between the two, since the principles of coexistence, including the most important of them—the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, apply to both sides.

Buchholz thus goes off at a tangent from the main issue in his arguments against the possibility of peaceful coexistence. Others who share this view conduct the argument on a different plane, attacking the communist attitude that capitalism is an outmoded system. Typical in this respect is *The Red Torrent* by H. van Bergh. "The Soviets," he writes, "see ... other participants at a conference not as their equal partners but as an enemy already condemned to death by history. For this reason they themselves can be not a real partner but a potential enemy."[3]

From this he draws the following sweeping conclusion: "For the Free West there can be no prolonged coexistence with the Soviet Union either *de facto* or *de jure*, since Marxism-Leninism has passed the death sentence on our world."[4]

In accusing Marxism-Leninism of regarding capitalism as a

---

[1] A. Buchholz, op. cit., pp. 50-51.
[2] Ibid., p. 52.
[3] H. van Bergh, *Die Rote Springflut*, München, 1958, S. 487.
[4] Ibid.

"condemned" social system and in treating this as an obstacle to peaceful coexistence, bourgeois ideologists deliberately ignore a fundamental aspect of the principle of coexistence. Peaceful competition between capitalism and socialism, like the ideological struggle between them, is not subject to any definite time limits, since the decay of capitalism on the one hand and the birth, firm establishment and development of socialism on the other are part of a natural historical process. It is therefore completely illogical to use the Marxist thesis of the inevitable doom of capitalism as the argument against peaceful coexistence.

Many opponents of peaceful coexistence claim that Lenin never put forward the idea of peaceful coexistence, and was even against such an idea. Bourgeois ideologists resort to this claim as an *ultima ratio* in their efforts to prove that peaceful coexistence is impossible. Falsification of Lenin's views on this subject has become a tradition in bourgeois philosophical, sociological and political literature. Sweeping statements are made to this effect which are completely unsupported by any evidence. Thus, in *Soviet Ideology Today*, an openly anti-communist work by Wetter and Leonhard, the latter writes that Lenin never elaborated a doctrine, theory or principle of peaceful coexistence, without making any attempt to show how he reached this conclusion.

B. Maurach, a regular contributor to the West German military journal *Wehrkunde*, also advances this view. "In discussing the theory of coexistence," he writes, "the Soviet leaders refer in their party programme to Lenin and speak of 'the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence'. In fact, however, Lenin never advanced the thesis of possible long-term coexistence between 'capitalism' and communist states."[1] This is the line taken by the well-known apostle of anti-communism Bochenski in his *Handbook of World Communism*, by Grewe in *German Foreign Policy in the Post-War Period* and many, many other ideologists of West German imperialism.

In view of these attempts to falsify Lenin's views on peaceful coexistence, some clarification is necessary. In point of fact, it was Lenin who for the first time in history advanced the idea of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, and formulated the fundamental principles on which relations between socialist and capitalist countries should be

[1] *Wehrkunde*, 1962. Nr. 2, S. 63.

based. He demonstrated scientifically the possibility and indeed historical inevitability of peaceful coexistence even before the October Revolution.

The policy of peaceful coexistence is based on Lenin's theory that socialism would triumph first in one or several countries, from which he concluded that the other countries would "for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois".[1]

With the triumph of the October Revolution in Russia, the existence side by side of countries with a totally different social system became an accomplished fact, and theory became practice. Lenin wrote: "...We are in a position of having won conditions enabling us to exist side by side with capitalist powers,"[2] and further on: "...We have something more than a breathing space: we have entered a new period, in which we have won the right to our fundamental international existence in the network of capitalist states."[3]

Lenin is clearly speaking not of a short, temporary stage, but of a long period in which capitalist and socialist countries will exist side by side, in other words, coexist. Although at that time the socialist system was limited to one country, nonetheless here was peaceful coexistence between capitalist and socialist states already demonstrated as an historical fact, from which derived as a historical necessity the need to establish the appropriate relations between these countries. It should be stressed that Lenin regarded peaceful coexistence between socialist and capitalist countries as a process of mutually beneficial economic exchange. In this connection Lenin wrote: "*The bourgeois countries must trade with Russia*; they know that unless they establish some form of economic relations their disintegration will continue in the way it has done up to now...."[4] Pointing out the necessity for the Land of the Soviets to trade with capitalist countries, he wrote: "We must trade with the capitalist countries as long as they exist."[5]

Thus, Lenin expressed his attitude to relations between the Land of the Soviets and the capitalist countries in perfectly clear, unequivocal terms. He pointed out that the nature of these relations depended on the good will and desire of either side, and stressed that the Soviet Republic was "decidedly for an

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 79.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 412.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid., Vol. 33, p. 214.
[5] Ibid., p. 215.

economic understanding ... with all countries...."[1] Failure to recognise these clear statements of the leader of the world proletariat's genuine attitude to the idea of peaceful coexistence indicates a definite aim—that of distorting historical truth in order to demonstrate the impossibility of peaceful coexistence.

In attacking the principle of peaceful coexistence and distorting its real meaning, bourgeois ideologists are deliberately shutting their eyes to the fact that coexistence is an objective historical necessity. The imperialist countries are forced to enter into economic and trade relations with the socialist world as an economic necessity. This was shown after the victory of the October Revolution in Russia. Today, when socialism has become a powerful world-wide economic system, the sphere of economic and cultural relations between capitalist and socialist countries has widened and deepened.

The whole course of historical development has confirmed beyond doubt the correctness of Lenin's proposition that "there is a force more powerful than the wishes, the will and the decisions of any of the governments or classes that are hostile to us. That force is world general economic relations, which compel them to make contact with us."[2]

It is pointless, to say the least, to try and prove the impossibility of something that exists as an objective historical reality. It is therefore perfectly futile to try and deduce from this the inevitability of a new world war. In fact, strict observance of the principles of peaceful coexistence between the socialist and capitalist countries is the only way to prevent a thermonuclear disaster, and preserve and strengthen world peace.

The struggle of the democratic forces in the European countries, including West Germany, against militarism and revanchism, has wrought definite changes in West Germany's foreign policy. The Coalition of Social-Democrats and Free Democrats, headed by Willy Brandt, has taken a set of measures to normalise the political situation in Europe.

Among these measures particular mention should be made of the treaties between the USSR and the FRG, Poland and the FRG, renouncing the use of force and recognising the post-war *status quo* of West Germany's eastern borders, the recogni-

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 51.
[2] Ibid., Vol. 33, p. 155.

tion by her of the sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic, and the settlement of the West Berlin question. These changes in the Federal Republic's foreign policy were made possible by the consistently peaceful policy of the USSR and other socialist countries, and show that the idea of peaceful coexistence is beginning to dominate the relations between countries with different social systems.

## Chapter XIII

# CRITICISM OF THE INTERPRETATION OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE AS PRESERVING THE SOCIAL *STATUS QUO*

The imperialist bourgeoisie have always been opposed to the theory and policy of peaceful coexistence between the countries of the socialist and capitalist systems. Immediately after the October Revolution in Russia the Western powers intervened with the aim of crushing the world's first socialist state.

After the Second World War, when the United States was for several years the only country with nuclear weapons, the idea of "rolling back communism" became a major aim of US policy, a policy that rejected peaceful coexistence with the socialist countries in favour of atomic blackmail, the object of which was the destruction of the socialist system. Echoes of this policy are still to be found today in the works of some of the most inveterate bourgeois reactionaries.

Times change however, and thanks to the tremendously increased power of socialism, peaceful coexistence has become a reality, and any attempt to change it by military means would involve the gravest risks. In view of the widespread support of peoples throughout the world for the principles of peaceful coexistence, reactionary politicians and sociologists (and some who are well-intentioned but misguided) are trying to produce various bourgeois versions of the doctrine of coexistence.

The most fashionable and widespread of these is the interpretation of peaceful coexistence as preservation of the *status quo*.

Ideologists of the imperialist countries aim to convince the public that any change in the world threatens the security of the West. The well-known American sociologist James Warburg writes: "*Status quoism* has created in the American mind the belief that the *status quo* is legal and that any change in the *status quo*—unless it be a change in the direction of restoring the *status quo ante*—is illegal."[1]

Capitalising on the sincere desire of the peoples to preserve peace, bourgeois ideologists try to place the principle of peaceful coexistence in the service of reaction, colonialism and capitalism, interpreting it as preservation of the *status quo*. The aim pursued in defending the *status quo*, as Soviet researchers have clearly demonstrated, is the preservation not of peace but of capitalism. What the various bourgeois interpretations of the *status quo* really amount to is a series of attempts to perpetuate capitalism and elicit from the communist governments guarantees of the permanence of the capitalist order in the countries where it has so far been preserved.

Obviously no sober-minded politician in the West can seriously believe that the socialist states are really going to give any such guarantees. In interpreting peaceful coexistence as preservation of the *status quo*, bourgeois ideologists are pursuing three more realistic political goals: firstly, that of containing and weakening the revolutionary movements in capitalist countries under the pretext of strengthening peaceful coexistence; secondly, that of weakening the struggle of the socialist countries in the international arena against imperialist policies under the same pretext, and, thirdly, that of justifying their aggressive interventionist policies on the grounds that the class struggle continues both in the international arena and in individual countries.

## The *Status Quo* and Attempts to Prevent Social Progress in Individual Countries

In treating the principle of peaceful coexistence as preservation of the *status quo*, bourgeois ideologists try to apply it to class relations, i.e., to relations within capitalist countries. In

[1] James P. Warburg, *The West in Crisis*, New York, 1959, p. 170.

this way oppressed classes and nations are deprived of the right to struggle for their emancipation, the right to revolution, under the pretext of preservation of peace. Thus, the American sociologist L. Perla writes: "Because we generally approve of the *status quo* in non-communist areas, we take the position that any change in such areas jeopardizes security,"[1] while his colleague George Catlin declares that peaceful coexistence presupposes "civil peace"—the reconciliation of classes within individual capitalist countries.

At this point any reasonably intelligent person is bound to wonder what possible connection there can be between events within capitalist countries and relations between capitalist and socialist countries. Supporters of *status quoism* offer the following answer to that one. The Soviet Communists speak of the inevitability of socialism triumphing throughout the world, which means that they are opposed to the *status quo* and thus to peaceful coexistence. They go on to deduce from this that peaceful coexistence is merely a trap, a cunning manoeuvre by the socialist countries.

It is pointless to seek any logic in such arguments. Communist policy Documents, including the Main Document of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties and the Programme of the CPSU, do, it is true, state the *objective necessity* and inevitability of revolution. Thus, the Programme of the CPSU points out that "the peoples can only come to socialism by way of socialist revolution", it being understood that such revolution may be peaceful or non-peaceful. However, bourgeois ideologists take the statement that revolution is an historical necessity and identify it with the export of revolution, and try to place the responsibility for the revolutionary activities of the masses in any part of the world on the Soviet Union, accusing the latter of violating the principle of peaceful coexistence.

But it is not simply a matter of the supporters of the *status quo* theory making completely unfounded accusations against the socialist countries: the whole theory itself is unscientific and completely divorced from reality. It rests on the false assumption that revolution is no longer a necessity. Thus, Erich Schieweck, who represents the interests of Bonn business circles, writes in his book, *The Out-of-Date World Revolution*, that the Western countries have achieved a high level of prosperity

[1] Leo Perla, *Can We End the Cold War? A Study in American Foreign Policy*, New York, 1960, p. 103.

and a great measure of political freedom, so that there is no longer any need for revolution.[1] French socialist leader P. Ramadier noted with satisfaction that the programmes of the majority of socialist parties in Western Europe did not necessarily support "the prospect of revolution and socialist society".[2]

To suppose that the existing situation can be preserved for an indefinite period is to adopt an unscientific standpoint and to reject the progressive nature of historical development.

Revolution is every bit as inevitable at the capitalist stage of social development as it was at any preceding stage. However, much as capitalist society may be touched up and modified by reforms, it will remain capitalist in essence just as long as capitalist private ownership of the means of production and the exploitation of man by man continue to exist. Only the abolition of private ownership and exploitation provides for the transition to socialism. It is quite impossible to effect this transition by means of reforms, without resorting to fundamental revolutionary transformations.

The world has now entered the historical phase of the transition from capitalism to socialism. After the fourteen socialist countries, several of the young sovereign states have embarked on their own specific revolutionary roads to socialism. History is confirming again and again that whatever stage of ripeness the conditions for establishing the new social order may have reached and however propitious the situation, the transition can only be effected by means of revolution, peaceful or otherwise.

As for the policy of peaceful coexistence, it rests on a *system of principles* that make it possible to avoid a major *international* conflict in the course of development of revolutionary processes within individual countries.

One of these principles is the principle of self-determination, i.e., recognition of the right of every people and nation to independently decide all matters relating to its own external affairs, up to and including the right to secession and the formation of a separate state, and its internal affairs, including the choice of its own social and political system. This principle, elaborated and advanced by the CPSU before the October Revolution as a political principle has since earned the official

---

[1] Erich Schieweck, *Die überholte Weltrevolution*, Düsseldorf, 1959.

[2] Paul Ramadier, *Les Socialistes et l'exercice du pouvoir*, Paris, 1961, p. 110.

recognition of all states and become an essential norm of international relations. Its inclusion in the UN Charter (article 1[2]) means that neither the United Nations itself nor any of its members engage to guarantee either the political and socio-economic or the territorial *status quo* of any state.[1] Since the chief aim of the UN is to support universal peace, clearly the attainment of this aim is envisaged against a background of continual change.

The imperialist countries may take advantage of revolutionary events in various countries as an excuse for interference in their internal affairs, and this may lead to counter-measures being taken by the socialist countries. It is for this reason that the principle of non-interference, applying to all countries, is another essential principle underlying the policy of peaceful coexistence. The imperialist countries often violate this principle, but this always provokes sharp condemnation on the part of people all over the world, and the interventionists are forced to take ever greater account of this and often even to retreat. Repeated attempts by the ideologists of intervention to discredit the principle of non-interference are of no avail. The great majority of states, especially the socialist countries and the young national states, and progressives everywhere, do their utmost to defend the principle as appropriate to the conditions of present social progress. The principle of non-interference serves both the cause of peace and the strengthening of state sovereignty.

Self-determination and non-interference, along with the other principles of peaceful coexistence (equality, mutual understanding and trust between states, taking one another's interests into account, respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity; the development of economic and cultural co-operation based on complete equality and mutual advantage),[2] provide a real opportunity for preserving peace in a period when progressive, revolutionary transformations are taking place within various countries. This has been repeatedly confirmed in practice. In the post-war period revolutions of national liberation have occurred in many countries, and socialist revolutions have taken place in Eastern Europe, China, Vietnam and Cuba. Yet none of these revolutions led to a world war. If some of these events led to an increase in international tension, this was simply due

---

[1] G. P. Zadorozhny, *Peaceful Coexistence*, Moscow, 1968.
[2] *The Road to Communism*, p. 506.

to interference on the part of the imperialist powers in internal affairs of other countries, for foreign interference invariably leads to a worsening of the international situation, irrespective of whether revolutionary or other events served as the pretext.

Thus, the policy of peaceful coexistence can ensure peace between capitalist and socialist countries while the intensification of revolutionary processes is in progress within class societies, without involving the abandonment of the class struggle or revolution, were this possible, which it is not.

## "The Revolution of Freedom" as a Means of Putting the Brakes on Social Progress

The idea of effecting a fundamental, revolutionary transformation of the world with the aim of abolishing oppression, coercion and social and national inequality has won the minds of hundreds of millions all over the world. More and more workers in the highly developed capitalist countries are coming to understand that this transformation is only feasible on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist revolution. Even in the socially backward countries, the bulk of the population and progressive individuals as yet unable to make a clean break with the traditional bourgeois outlook already accept "certain aspects of Marxism", as Lenin put it, certain of its slogans and demands. In all these countries there can be observed a general longing for a revolutionary transformation of society on socialist principles, as expressed in their choice of the non-capitalist path of development.

In these circumstances many Western ideologists are beginning to realise the impossibility of denying the need for changes even under the pretext of preserving peace. The bankruptcy of the reactionary pacifist theory of preserving the *status quo* is particularly clear in the case of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, where the need for revolutionary changes is patently evident. Hence the increasing publicity being given in bourgeois sociology and politics to their new brain-child, the theory of "democratic" revolution or "the revolution of freedom", meaning reforms carried out from above by the ruling groups with the object of consolidating their position. Bourgeois ideologists claim that the "revolution of freedom" has the

advantage of recognising the need for changes while rejecting violence. Numerous theories are advanced under the general panoply of the revolution of freedom, but they all have this in common.

In 1963 a book entitled *A Warless World* was published in the United States. It included articles by famous bourgeois law experts, philosophers, historians and statesmen, in which the inevitability of social changes was taken for granted. Thus, Arnold Toynbee, the historian, wrote: "A policy of accepting and promoting peaceful change is a necessary condition for the maintenance of a warless world."[1] Yet all the authors or the articles somehow manage to dodge the main issue, which is how to ensure that all the changes necessary for progress are carried out. For they insist, like the editor Arthur Larson, that "fundamental to the whole concept of peaceful change is the principle that real change can most effectively take place within the framework of law".[2] Yet bourgeois law protects private ownership of the means of production: socialist revolution is thus illegal as being directed towards the liquidation of exploitation and private ownership.

The imperialist bourgeoisie employs the slogan of "non-violent revolution" merely as a means of deceiving the masses. This can be plainly seen in the demagogy of American imperialism.

John Foster Dulles, former US Secretary of State, understood the inevitability of change, although he continually underestimated it in his practical activity. "Change is the law of life," he wrote, "of international life as well as national and personal life. If we set up barriers to all change, we make it certain that there will be violent and explosive change."[3]

The setbacks suffered by the Americans in the course of their aggression in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, and the sharp criticism this policy has provoked from the public and governments even of bourgeois countries, have led US leaders to make wider use of the "freedom revolution" theory, adapting it to their own interests.

At the end of June and the beginning of July 1965, *The New York Times* published a series of reactionary articles on wars of national liberation. In compiling the material for the

---

[1] *A Warless World*, New York, 1963, p. 39.
[2] Ibid., p. 56.
[3] John Foster Dulles, *War or Peace*, New York, 1950, p. 18.

articles the paper drew on statements made by President Johnson, Vice-President Humphrey, the United States representative in the UN Stevenson, and other leading figures on the need to find an alternative "revolutionary" theory to national liberation and socialist revolutions.

Thus, the first article contained the following comment on the revolutionary movement in Latin America: "Washington wants the revolutions to be democratic and peaceful under the Alliance for Progress. The Communists seek revolution through the 'wars of liberation'."[1]

The theory of "democratic" revolution was first formulated in detail as a policy of the US Government in a speech made by the then Secretary of State Dean Rusk at a symposium at the University of Tennessee, in May 1962. Rusk made some curious admissions, declaring that "great revolutionary forces are at work in our era", and that these "tremendous, often conflicting, forces are pressing for change". He reiterated the President's call "to resume our leadership of the revolution of freedom and to join with it our leadership in the revolution of economic and social progress".[2] Rusk's statements are of interest as representing the policy programme of the Democratic Party with regard to the current world revolutionary process.

What is the essence of this policy?

Rusk was not prepared to admit the existence of revolutionary outbursts in Asia, Africa and Latin America, maintaining that it was simply a question of "industrial revolution". By refusing to ascribe to the revolutionary movement in the less developed countries aims other than those of "industrial revolution", and ignoring the fact that the aims are really far, far wider, he was attempting to minimise the importance of popular unrest—a time-honoured stratagem of imperialist ruling circles. In point of fact, events in Asia, Africa and Latin America are not isolated outbreaks of revolt due to "poverty", as Rusk would have us believe, but social revolution: the anti-colonial revolution aims not only to remove foreign oppression and imperialist domination, but at the same time to implement far-reaching social transformations.

Rusk is loth to admit the international working class revolutionary movement and its main offspring—the world socialist system—to be a revolutionary force, and endeavours to represent

---

[1] *The New York Times*, June 30, 1965.
[2] Ibid., May 12, 1962.

it as "the counter-revolution of coercion". As a former teacher of sociology, Rusk is well aware that the term "revolutionary" is applied to those forces that overthrow an old, outmoded order, while the term "counter-revolutionary" applies to those forces that try to defend it. But he is not too fussy with his definitions as long as they serve his purpose.

Having undertaken to defend a system that is condemned to destruction by history, Rusk can perhaps be excused for his failure to conform to the principles of elementary logic. He rejects socialist revolution on the grounds that it is carried out by means of force. Yet he can hardly fail to be aware that no major revolution in history has triumphed without the use of force, since the obsolete ruling classes have never voluntarily relinquished their privileged position. The American revolution, of which US leaders claim to be the heirs, only triumphed after a fierce armed struggle. Its programme document, the Declaration of Rights—which Rusk, by the way, quotes in his speech —contains the statement: "All men are created equal.... Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. ... Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it."

Rusk might also care to remember the words of Thomas Jefferson: "A little rebellion, now and then, is a good thing, and as necessary in the political world as storms are in the physical." US leaders and ideologists are, for obvious reasons, wont to forget them, despite the fact that they were uttered by a great leader of the American revolution to whose principles they swear fidelity often enough. How can any one claim to be carrying on the cause of the American revolution and at the same time reject the use of force which was a fundamental condition ensuring its triumph?

Rusk even goes as far as to say that socialist revolution is carried out without the support of the masses "against the will of the majority" by a "tight conspiratorial organisation". This at least represents a certain amount of progress from the time when the enemies of socialism maintained that the socialist system only comes on "the bayonets of the Red Army". The triumph of socialist revolution in China, Vietnam and Cuba has effectively silenced those who preached that view. But the idea that socialist revolution can be carried out without the support of the masses (by an internal conspiratorial organisation) cannot be seriously entertained by anybody in his right

mind. Rusk himself admits that the Communists have gained control of "all or part of 18 nations with some 1 billion people". How could the Communists, who began with "a small revolutionary party in Russia" and were opposed by the whole old world armed to the teeth have achieved such remarkable success without the support of the masses? It would seem to suggest intervention by some supernatural power—a power that is clearly pro-communist.

Let us take a look now at the kind of "revolution" Mr. Rusk advocates. This concept of revolution, in Rusk's own words, "is magnificently simple: it was stated by Thomas Jefferson with an eloquence which will never die". Rusk speaks hazily of the desirability of applying certain general principles of the American revolution in other countries, without saying a word about their observance at home. Perhaps because at the time he occupied the post of head of the Department of State? But more likely for other, more substantial reasons.

The general aim of the policy of "freedom revolution" formulated in Rusk's speech is more than hazy—"uniting the nations into one great family of men". However, the six specific political tasks that Rusk attributes to this "revolution" make it possible to form a pretty clear opinion.

*The first task* is to convince the peoples of the developing countries that the shortest road to progress lies not via communism but via capitalism, "to show those peoples what free peoples have achieved and are achieving in freedom". The evidence offered is the economic development of two southern states of the USA as a result of hydrotechnical works in the Tennessee Valley. Rusk waxes sentimental in recalling his childhood spent in these parts. "There is a certain poignancy," he says, "in the fact that unemployed CCC [Civilian Conservation Corps] boys in the thirties planted seedlings which today are producing new jobs" (in forestry.—*The Author*). But the picture Rusk draws is not really calculated to impress the less developed countries. For a start, as Rusk himself admits, back in the thirties, that is after more than a hundred years of capitalist development, one-third of the population of this region suffered from malaria, unemployment drove people to accept any work, even the most menial, that was going, and the average annual income was 168 dollars, or about the same as it is now in the less developed countries. Moreover, despite tremendous capital investment, on a scale quite beyond the means of the less developed countries, the average income in the area is still

only 65 per cent of the national average. It took capitalism 180 years to achieve this, and the economically less developed countries want to catch up with the advanced countries in a couple of generations.

*The second task* is to "maintain great and varied forces, capable of responding to a variety of challenges. We must have ... a capability for helping other free nations defend themselves against guerilla and other subversive attacks". Here is a frank admission of the true aim of the "revolution of freedom"—to crush revolutionary movements directed towards emancipation from imperialist and social oppression. The world has already seen how the US Government helps countries "defend themselves from guerilla attacks". The organisation of brazen intervention in revolutionary Cuba, armed intervention in the affairs of the Dominican Republic, open, though not officially declared, war against the peoples of Indochina, support for the Belgian, Portuguese and British colonialists in crushing the revolutions of national liberation in the Congo, Angola and Oman, and aggression in the Middle East—these are just a few cases from the long list of American measures to counter the world revolutionary process in the past few years. The United States is acting not as a revolutionary force but as an international gendarme.

*The third task* is "to consolidate the bonds between the already more highly industrialised nations, such as our allies of Western Europe, Canada and Japan". Rusk makes no secret of the fact that in giving all-out support to the formation of a capitalist Common Market, American ruling circles are pursuing their own strategic and economic ends. He admits that the establishment of "interdependence" between the USA and the Common Market would lead to "a consolidation of the strength of the great industrial powers within the predictable future".

*The fourth task* is "a long-term partnership with the developing nations of Latin America, of Africa and Asia to assist them in their plans to carry forward the revolution of economic and social progress". But it is clear from what Rusk says that the US Government is interested not in the development but in the restriction of revolution, for he declares that "with one or two exceptions ... the crises of the past decade have arisen in the newly-independent ... areas of the world". The conclusion is that the task of the United States should be to put the brakes on the process of national liberation, hold up the development

of the revolutionary process in the newly-liberated countries and force them to remain within the world capitalist system. According to Rusk, "the future of the world and our own peace and prosperity will almost certainly depend" on how successful America is in carrying out this task.

*The fifth and sixth tasks*—to draw new countries into "free partnership" on the pattern of NATO and SEATO, and help bring about the day when capitalism will be restored in the socialist countries and "they may join us in common existence in the community of free men"—are so openly reactionary that it is an insult to anybody's intelligence to expect him to accept them as "revolutionary".

Rusk's statements, not to mention the actions of the US Government, show that there is in fact not one iota of revolutionary content in the "revolution of freedom" slogan. US leaders only resort to recalling the glorious revolutionary traditions of the American people for the purpose of masking their reactionary policy of preserving the capitalist, colonial *status quo* that is so odious to the peoples of the world with borrowed communist slogans and the revolutionary battle standards of the past. Even the highly respectable bourgeois historian Arnold Toynbee feels obliged to admit that America, once a revolutionary nation, "is today the leader of a world-wide anti-revolutionary movement in defence of vested interests".[1] Further on he writes: "I am maintaining that, since 1917, America has reversed her role in the world. She has become the arch-conservative power instead of the arch-revolutionary one. Stranger still, she has made a present of her glorious discarded role to the country which was the arch-conservative power in the nineteenth century, the country which, since 1946, has been regarded by America as being America's Enemy Number One. America has presented this historic revolutionary role to Russia."[2] Further on again, he addresses the American leaders: "... during these last forty-four years, your revolution has gone ahead without you. The leadership has fallen into other hands. These non-American hands could never have seized the leadership of your revolution if you had not dropped it."[3]

This was also admitted in *The New York Times* in an edi-

---

[1] A. Toynbee, *America and the World Revolution*, New York-London, 1962, p. 92.

[2] Ibid., p. 102.

[3] Ibid., pp. 150-151.

torial on the subject of "democratic" revolutions in the struggle against wars of national liberation: "The United States also has a sometimes deserved reputation as a defender of the *status quo*, of capitalism as we interpret it, of democracy only in our form, of opposing social reform if it comes from the left and of complacently accepting *coups d'état* from the right."[1] These lines were written over three years after the theory of "freedom revolution" was first proclaimed official US foreign policy by the then Secretary of State Mr. Rusk, and serve to show how this policy has proved itself in practice to be nothing more than a Big Stick policy. This is understandable, since the liberal content of the theory (the demand for "social justice for the underprivileged", democratic reforms, etc.) is not practicable within the framework of the capitalist system, while what is practicable (suppression of internal aggression, the defence of free enterprise, etc.) has nothing at all to do with either revolution or freedom.

## The Demand for Ending the Class Struggle in the Sphere of International Affairs

Peaceful coexistence does not, however, mean a cessation of the struggle between the two opposed social systems in the sphere of international relations. The objective laws of development of a society composed of antagonistic classes apply not only to the internal life of nations but also on a world scale. The attempts made by Western sociologists to interpret peaceful coexistence as an admission of the inevitability of the "perpetual" existence of the two systems are unrealistic and unscientific.[2]

The point about peaceful coexistence is that it ensures that the international struggle is waged not by military means but is confined to the sphere of economics, politics and ideology, and thus does not threaten the life and welfare of peoples.

---

[1] *The New York Times*, July 3, 1965.

[2] See *The Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union*, pp. 405-07; P. Bastid, "*Les principes juridiques et moraux de la coexistence*" in *Bulletin Interparlamentaire*, No. 1, 1955, p. 7; S. Fischer-Galati, "Soviet Policy in East Europe" in *Current History*, November 1959, p. 278.

Supporters of *status quo*-ism, on the other hand, base their attacks at peaceful coexistence on the fact that it involves struggle, ignoring the essential feature of this struggle—its peaceful nature.

So great is the panic of Western, and especially US politicians, at the very idea of revolutionary changes that, as the sociologist Warburg notes, they are ready to see any change at all in the world as a threat to their state security.[1]

Western ideologists are in fact demanding as a condition for their agreement to peaceful coexistence that the socialist states commit themselves to refusing to support revolutionary movements, "not allowing" revolutions to take place in the capitalist world, and practically co-operating with them in putting down such revolts of the masses. Lord Douglas-Home, then British Minister for Foreign Affairs, suggested at a Conservative Party meeting in Buckinghamshire that the socialist countries should give the West assurances, firstly, that there should be no revolutions in capitalist countries, and secondly, that they should put an end to the class struggle in the international arena.

But peaceful coexistence is the result of the appearance on the international scene of socialist states that are peace-loving by their class content, the result of the existing relationship of forces between socialism and capitalism. The West, therefore, is not in a position to dictate terms of coexistence.

Imperialist ideologists (such as the Americans J. Hazard and P. Reynolds, and the French sociologist R. Aron) approach the policy of peaceful coexistence from the standpoint of cessation of the class struggle.

They describe peaceful coexistence as a "tendentious Marxist" theory, diametrically opposed to "the objective, non-Marxist" concept of peaceful co-operation.

Thus, R. Aron and P. Reynolds write: "Peaceful coexistence derives from a philosophy of class conflict which is so projected on to the international scene that no relationship except one of hostility is conceivable between states of different economic systems.... Peaceful co-operation derives from a philosophy of moral community and common interests...."[2]

The idea of replacing peaceful coexistence with "peaceful

---

[1] J. Warburg, *The West in Crisis*, p. 170.

[2] R. I. Aron, P. A. Reynolds, "Peaceful Coexistence and Peaceful Co-operation", *Political Studies*, Oxford, October 1956, Vol. IV, No. 3, p. 289.

co-operation", purged of class conflict, highly attractive though it may be for bourgeois politicians, is completely unrealistic and scientifically unwarranted.

The capitalist countries themselves have no intention of renouncing class conflict in the international sphere. The imperialist bourgeoisie still hopes by means of tendentious propaganda and slanderous attacks on socialism to undermine the existing order in the socialist countries and divert the masses in the capitalist countries from socialist revolution. The book *Protracted Conflict,* by members of the staff of the Foreign Affairs Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, describes ideological influence on the citizens of the socialist states as a major strategic task of the West to be achieved by propaganda of the "Western way of life" by all possible means—tourist and student exchange visits, wireless propaganda and so on and so forth.

Class conflict is an objective law of social development wherever social antagonisms exist. There can be no class peace between colonies and colonial powers, between young states and the imperialist monopolies that have them in their grasp, between aggressors and victims of aggression. Even between bourgeois states, which belong to the same social system, a ceaseless struggle is in progress that frequently leads to war. How then can economic competition and political and ideological conflict be expected to cease between states belonging to antagonistic social systems? Especially when, as we shall show, the imperialist countries are conducting a policy aimed at the destruction of the existing order in the socialist countries and the restoration of capitalism. As long as imperialism continues to exist in the world, causing wars, misery, poverty, enslavement and exploitation, the peoples of the socialist countries, educated in the spirit of proletarian internationalism, cannot cease the struggle against its crimes. Let us now take a look at the three main spheres in which the socialist countries wage this struggle—the economic, political and ideological spheres.

*Economic competition* between the two systems is not only inevitable, but is to the advantage of the peoples of the respective countries. Unlimited, unrestricted economic competition is the one peaceful way in present conditions of resolving the great historical controversy of our age: which system—the capitalist or the socialist—is best. In the long run, after all, victory will go to the system that ensures man a better life,

that is, most fully satisfies his material and spiritual needs. The inevitability and necessity of economic competition between the two systems is so obvious that it is recognised by many of the more intelligent Western politicians.

*The political struggle* waged by the socialist camp in the sphere of international relations has the purpose of ensuring free national, social, economic and cultural progress for all peoples, in conditions excluding world war and foreign interference. The socialist countries try to achieve this by increasing the vigilance of the peoples of the world, exposing imperialism and its aggressive policies, arousing the anger of the masses against warmongers and colonialists, drawing new sections of the population into the peace movement, and strengthening co-operation with all countries conducting a policy of peace. They offer wide moral and political support to the forces of peace—the international labour movement and its various ramifications, the national liberation movement, and other progressive movements.

*The ideological conflict* in which the socialist countries are involved in the sphere of international relations is also inevitable. The conflict of ideas, reflecting processes of development and paving the way to progress, takes place in any society, but is especially inevitable in an antagonistic society or a system of antagonistic societies. Irreconcilable ideas, political theories and outlooks reflect the different position of classes in the process of production, and will continue to exist and conflict as long as antagonistic classes exist.

In reality, genuine peaceful co-operation and conflict exist simultaneously and are interconnected. Thus, there could hardly be co-operation with the peace movement without simultaneous conflict with those who reject or distort the theory of peaceful coexistence, with the forces of reaction, militarism and revenge.

The main aim pursued by imperialist ideologists in demanding that the socialist countries renounce class conflict in international relations, is to disrupt the policy of proletarian internationalism and drive a wedge between the international labour and national liberation movements and the world socialist system.

Bourgeois sociologists slander the policy of the socialist countries, accusing them of "illegal acts", of breaking the UN Charter and violating the principles of peaceful coexistence, of using "any and all non-military means ... for the ultimate

termination of the capitalist system", and for establishing their own world hegemony, and so on.[1] Such slander serves the policy of the ruling classes in capitalist countries. Thus, Mr. Martin, Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs, speaking at a meeting of the Montreal section of the International Law Association, claimed that the theory of peaceful coexistence provided the communist countries with a theoretical basis for subversive activities in the countries of the "Free World" while maintaining normal relations with them.

Reactionary ideologists struggling against support for the revolutionary movements can claim neither progressive political principles nor morality to be on their side. This is why they transfer the question of the nature and acceptability of such movements to the plane of formal law. But in so doing they are making yet another grave miscalculation, for if revolution was perhaps regarded as illegal according to the principles of international law prior to 1917, present-day international law views the matter somewhat differently. The UN Charter admits the right of every people and nation to decide for itself all questions of its internal and international life (Article 2 [1]). Admission of the right of every nation to determine its own destiny is tantamount to admission of its right to transform its life by revolution. It is not a question of revolution being derived from law, but of law confirming the objective tendencies of the development of human society. This being the case, from the point of view of international legality, revolutions of national liberation and social revolutions are a progressive, lawful phenomenon.

There was a time when the Soviet Union was one of the few countries to defend this point of view. Today, however, it has been accepted by the majority of countries. This in itself represents a major triumph. The fact that a political principle has become accepted as a principle of international law formally binding on all countries is convincing proof of its viability and validity.

The lawfulness of wars of liberation is implicit in the Declaration of Human Rights, in the Preamble: "Whereas it is essential, if mankind is not to be compelled as a last resort to rebel

---

[1] Wladislaw W. Kulski, *Peaceful Coexistence. An Analysis of Soviet Foreign Policy*, Chicago, 1959, p. 137. See also Milton Kovner, *The Challenge of Coexistence*, Washington, 1961, p. 108, and Elliot R. Goodman, *The Soviet Design for a World State*, New York, 1961, p. 49.

against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by a regime of law...." The Cairo Conference of Non-Aligned Countries expressly recognised the legality of wars of national liberation and did so on roughly the same basis as the Soviet Union in its Documents. "The process of liberation," the Cairo communiqué ran, "is irresistible and irreversible. The colonial peoples can lawfully resort to arms, to completely guarantee their right to self-determination and independence, if the colonial countries insist on repressing their natural aspirations."

Recognition of the lawfulness of revolutions naturally throws a new light on the question of the assistance offered by the socialist countries to the young sovereign states and the peoples who have risen up in social or national liberation revolutions. In principle the offering of such assistance is perfectly lawful and today it is only the form in which it is offered that is an object of dispute. This is the view now held by the majority of states. It is actively supported by the African countries, and by many other non-aligned countries. The participants in the Cairo Conference decided "to work ceaselessly for the destruction of all remnants of colonialism and unite all their efforts to offer all the necessary assistance and support—moral, political or material—to peoples fighting against colonialism or neo-colonialism" (Part 1).

Bourgeois ideologists are fond of asking the following provocative questions: will the Soviet Union interfere if a socialist revolution occurs in a capitalist country? and will it resort to armed force on the grounds that its contradictions with capitalism are of an antagonistic nature?[1] These questions can be answered as follows.

The assistance offered by the socialist countries to social revolutions is in conformity with the methods permitted by the UN Charter (support for the revolutionary people in UN bodies, mobilisation of public opinion, moral support, and so on). The main aim is to ensure that nobody interferes in the internal affairs of the country where the revolution has begun (i.e., opposition to the export of counter-revolution). Unlike the imperialist countries, which organise subversive activities against lawful governments (viz., the United States against the Cuban Government), the Soviet Union and the socialist countries do

[1] *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, Beilage zur Wochenzeitung *Das Parlament*, July 15, 1959.

not send their troops into other countries, do not set up military bases and arms dumps on their territory, and do not call for the overthrow of existing regimes. Such activities would greatly facilitate the organisation of aggression for the imperialists.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are determined opponents of the "export of revolution". They hold that revolution can and will triumph in all countries as a result of internal development, through the people's own liberation activities. Antagonistic contradictions exist in all capitalist countries and they will resolve themselves in a peaceful or non-peaceful manner depending on the situation within a given country.

The socialist countries have absolutely no reason whatsoever to violate the principle of peaceful coexistence, which it is in their interests to observe. This is recognised even by such a diehard imperialist ideologist as Schlamm to whom we have already had occasion to refer. Schlamm writes: "Communism thrives on peace, desires peace, and triumphs in conditions of peace."[1] Peaceful coexistence may not suit the revanchists, Schlamm, and all those like him who still hope to see communism defeated, but then whether it suits them or not is rather beside the point. The socialist countries have absolutely no need to resort to military measures to resolve the contradictions of capitalism. So much for the second question.

The support the Soviet Union and other socialist countries offer national liberation movements comes under particularly heavy fire from reactionary imperialist sociologists. The reactionary article "Wars of Liberation", published in *The New York Times*, repeated the panicky warnings of US leaders and their foremost ideologists to the effect that the Soviet Union and certain other socialist countries "are at work trying to undermine societies [capitalist societies.—*The Author.*] as termites do a wooden house".[2]

The socialist countries do indeed offer peoples fighting for their national independence material as well as moral and political assistance. But these peoples are bearers of national sovereignty, their revolutionary forces have the rights of combatants and their organs of power receive official international recognition as lawful subjects of international law. In the field of international affairs they are accepted as having many of the

---

[1] W. Schlamm, *Die Grenzen des Wunders*, Zürich, 1959, S. 185.
[2] *The New York Times*, June 30, 1965, p. 36.

same rights of already established states, including the right of receiving outside assistance. Thus, the socialist countries have every right to assist them even from the strictly legal point of view.

The Soviet Union has long been offering considerable assistance to peoples struggling for their independence. Thus, the peoples of Algeria, the Yemen, Angola, Mozambique, Egypt and many other countries have accepted Soviet political, moral and material support. A number of other countries have begun to follow suit recently. Several African countries are forming bases on their territory for the training and instruction of insurgents from the Portuguese colonies, providing them with arms and equipment. Such actions represent lawful collective self-defence by the African countries against the collective aggression of the colonialists (Portugal being supported by countries of the NATO bloc).

While condemning imperialist wars and all other wars of aggression, the socialist countries support wars of liberation, which are sacred popular wars against enslavement, colonial rule and imperialist oppression. Such wars are recognised by present-day international law. The UN Charter condemns wars of aggression but recognises the right of peoples to individual or collective self-defence, i.e., the right to conduct a war of liberation. Such a war is an extreme method of defending national sovereignty which peoples only resort to when the imperialists leave them no other choice. The offering of assistance to peoples conducting a war of liberation does not undermine peaceful coexistence, but on the contrary, strengthens it. It is not only the right, but the duty of all peace-loving countries to offer such assistance.

The socialist countries strictly adhere to the principles of peaceful coexistence because they are peaceful by their very nature and are guided by the most humane ideology—Marxism-Leninism. Observance of these principles is in their own interests and in the interests of the international revolutionary movement. This is why the socialist countries have adopted peaceful coexistence as an essential part of their policy and pursue it consistently and not whenever it suits them.

The internationalist policy conducted by the socialist countries with respect to the national liberation movements is just in its aims and lawful in its methods. Whoever is defending a just cause has no need to violate the principles of peaceful coexistence.

## The Export of Counter-Revolution As a Means of Preserving the Social *Status Quo*

Some bourgeois sociologists realise fully well that economic competition, and political and ideological struggle between the two systems is inevitable, but are averse to these objective historical processes taking place in conditions of peaceful coexistence. They propose an alternative to peaceful coexistence, "competitive coexistence", whose content has nothing at all to do with either peace or coexistence. As is clear from a book by the American sociologist J. Scott in which this theory is expounded, the theory is intended to justify the United States' policy of intervention and economic sabotage.[1] It is really identical with imperialist cold war policies, the object of which, as has been frequently demonstrated during the last couple of decades, is to undermine peaceful coexistence.

The governments of the imperialist powers encourage the view that peaceful coexistence is merely another name for the cold war, now and then becoming hotted up in certain parts of the world in small local wars. This interpretation of peaceful coexistence suits them perfectly, since only in force and aggression do they see any possibility of preserving the social *status quo* which is so dear to their hearts and so odious to the peoples of the world. Thus, Strausz-Hupé and his colleagues, whom we have already had occasion to mention, declare: "Force, if it is to be used at all, should serve to preserve the *status quo*."[2]

On the basis of the practical action of their governments, Western statesmen and scholars try to show that in present-day conditions the principle of non-interference is out-of-date, and widespread intervention should replace peaceful coexistence as the rule of international relations. The campaign to discredit peaceful coexistence is waged by a whole army of well-paid philosophers, jurists and publicists. Some of them try to deny altogether the unlawful nature of the imperialist policy of aggression. Others are prepared to admit it, but attempt to

---

[1] J. Scott, *Political Warfare. A Guide to Competitive Coexistence*, New York, 1955.

[2] R. Strausz-Hupé, W. R. Kintner, J. Dougherty, A. Cottrell, *Protracted Conflict*, p. 25.

justify it. In a lengthy tome published in the USA, the claim is made that large-scale American intervention in the internal affairs of other nations does not run contrary to the principles of peaceful coexistence and is justifiable, especially when the aim is the defence of important national rights and interests. Its author, D. Graber, writes: "...Despite the magnitude and multiplicity of American interventions in many parts of the world, the State Department, as a rule, denies that interventions have occurred and are continuing, instead of admitting their existence and explaining the political and legal reasons which justify American policy."[1]

Another American sociologist, C. Eagleton, attempts to justify American intervention in the internal affairs of other nations on the grounds of strategical considerations and interest in natural resources,[2] while Professor Burnham writes that "the doctrine of 'non-intervention in the internal affairs of other nations'—already little more than a verbal shell—would have to be discarded altogether".[3]

Such adductions made by the apostles of capitalism against the principle and policy of peaceful coexistence are completely unfounded and do not withstand the slightest criticism.

To begin with, the world socialist community, the newly-independent states and public opinion in the capitalist countries greatly hamper the interventionist policy of the imperialists.

Secondly, it is wrong to deduce that the multiplicity of imperialist interventions make peaceful coexistence impossible. Infringement of the law does not affect the validity of the law itself. The fact that there is an increase in the cases of robbery in certain capitalist countries does not lead to the repeal of the laws protecting private property or changes in the criminal code concerning the sentences for such crimes. International principles come into existence and are applied as and when they are needed by states. Thus, the principles of peaceful coexistence, including the principle of non-intervention, will remain valid as long as there exist states whose sovereignty they are intended and called upon to protect.

Thirdly, the policy of peaceful coexistence is not a generous

---

[1] D. A. Graber, *Crisis Diplomacy. A History of US Intervention Policies and Practices*, Washington, 1959, p. X.

[2] C. Eagleton, "Excesses of Self-determination", *Foreign Affairs*, July 1953, p. 596.

[3] J. Burnham, *The Struggle for the World*, New York, 1947, p. 174.

concession made by the imperialists to the peoples of their own free will, but the result of the existing relationship of forces in the world, the outcome of the struggle for peace of the socialist countries. The imperialists, therefore, cannot reject peaceful coexistence even if they want to. Any attempt by the imperialists to torpedo peaceful coexistence invariably meets with counter-action on the part of the socialist countries and other anti-imperialist forces.

Fourthly, attempts to preserve the *status quo* by force runs directly counter to the aim they are claimed to be serving—the preservation of peace. This is admitted by all objective bourgeois sociologists. Thus, the well-known American sociologist Mills wrote: "The continued attempt by the USA to defend the economic and political *status quo* of the world today will end in war."[1] Indeed, imperialist attempts to obstruct revolutionary changes in many parts of the world have constituted, and continue to constitute a serious threat to world peace.

One extremely effective method of preserving peaceful coexistence in today's world of revolutionary change is the struggle against the export of counter-revolution. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union cannot remain an indifferent bystander and watch the imperialists trampling underfoot the principle of peaceful coexistence and drowning revolutionary movements in blood. Faithful to the principles of peaceful coexistence and proletarian solidarity, the CPSU resolutely opposes the imperialist policy of intervention and the export of counter-revolution. "Together with the other Marxist-Leninist parties, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union regards it as its international duty to call on the peoples of all countries to rally, muster all their internal forces, take vigorous action, and drawing on the might of the world socialist system, frustrate or firmly repel imperialist interference in the affairs of the people of any country risen in revolt, and thereby prevent imperialist export of counter-revolution."[2]

Opposition to the export of counter-revolution is of tremendous importance both for the future of world socialism and for ensuring peaceful coexistence. Measures taken in this direction are essentially measures of collective defence, which are just in their aims and sanctioned by the UN Charter. The Soviet

---

[1] Wright Mills, *The Causes of World War Three*, New York, 1958, p. 116.

[2] *The Road to Communism*, p. 484.

Union has helped to prevent or oppose the export of counter-revolution on several occasions and every time it proved to the benefit of the cause of peace. This was the case in 1956, 1957 and 1958, when the USSR prevented the gains of the national liberation revolutions of the Arab peoples from being lost, and it was the case in 1961 and 1962, when the Soviet Union and other peace-loving states helped the heroic Cuban people defend their state sovereignty. The Soviet Union continues to perform its duty in helping the heroic Vietnamese people and the Arab countries to oppose imperialist intervention.

The export of counter-revolution is the chief means of preserving the *status quo* and a most serious act of aggression and international crime, and the Communists, in mobilising all progressive forces to prevent or oppose it, are defending the principles of peaceful coexistence and promoting universal peace, thereby rendering an invaluable service to mankind.

* * *

One of the fundamental contradictions between the imperialist ideology and Marxist-Leninist ideology is reflected in their vastly different approach to the *status quo*. Attempts by Western ideologists to replace the policy of peaceful coexistence with the policy of perpetuating the *status quo* are incompatible with the objective laws of social development, and run counter to the views of the progressive classes and the universally accepted principles of international relations. They are, moreover, discredited by the actions of the Western powers themselves, who behind the smoke screen of talk of preserving the *status quo* are actually engaged in attempts to export counter-revolution, and destroy the gains of the peoples of the socialist countries and the young national states. *Status quo*-ism is not merely reactionary: it is futile, since it is incapable of achieving the aim it claims to serve—that of ensuring peace. Moreover, it is entirely superfluous, since mankind has already evolved the system of principles of peaceful coexistence, which makes it possible to avert a new world war in the conditions of the irreversible world revolutionary process.

## Chapter XIV

# AGAINST THE THEORY OF IDEOLOGICAL DISARMAMENT

As time goes on more and more people are coming to share the conviction that the major contradiction of our age, the contradiction between socialism and capitalism, must not on any account be resolved by means of a new world war.

Of course, there are still many people in the world of finance capital, and very influential people at that, who still place their hopes in armed force and hold that "there is no possible compromise between East and West on any issue of importance".[1] Nevertheless, even in bourgeois circles, sensible admissions of the fact that a nuclear conflict between the two socio-economic systems is not the answer are to be heard more and more frequently.

The fact that part of the monopoly bourgeoisie are against a new world war does not mean that they recognise their impotence, the futility of their attempts to stop the march of history; nor is it based on any humane considerations. It is merely the result of a sober appraisal of the situation, the recognition that in the situation that obtains in the world today, a world war would not serve to further the aims of the imperialist bourgeoisie. As Senator Fulbright put it: "we have reached a point in history in which no rational man can conceive of war as a useful instrument of national policy."[2]

---

[1] Paul Anderson, *Thermonuclear Warfare*, Derby, 1963, p. 102.

[2] *Congressional Record. Proceedings and Debates of the 89th Congress.*

At the same time, the ideological struggle is assuming ever greater importance. The reasons for this are to be sought in material, socio-economic conditions. Today, when the objective conditions for revolutionary transition to socialism have matured everywhere, the matter of carrying out the transition depends on the subjective factor, namely, on the awareness of the masses of their fundamental interests and historical tasks, and their organisation and conscious activity directed towards the abolition of capitalism. Thus, the transition to socialism, the objective conditions for which have already matured, of necessity requires that ideas be called upon to play an organising and mobilising role.

The growing acceptance of the principle of peaceful coexistence in international relations and the increasing importance the ideological struggle is assuming in the world are not regarded as isolated phenomena from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint. Both are products of present-day socio-economic conditions. Moreover, peaceful coexistence creates a new situation for the ideological struggle and is at the same time directly dependent on it. Thus, actual conditions link the struggle for peace with the class conflict between socialism and capitalism and bring to the forefront the problem of peaceful coexistence and the ideological struggle.

In bourgeois ideology this problem is treated in numerous ways, both as regards how the question is posed and the practical solutions offered. This is dictated by the class views of the individual ideologist in question, to what particular group of finance, middle or petty bourgeoisie he belongs, by his political sympathies and his individual abilities, including his ability to make a more or less sober appraisal of history within the limits of his basic world view. But all these different anti-Marxist views have one feature in common: they all adopt a subjective-idealist approach. Thus, the concept of ideological struggle is invariably treated as an absolutely self-contained sphere of human activity, dependent entirely on the whims and arbitrary desires of the protagonists, and even directing the course of historical events along avenues chosen according to the abilities of the ideologists and the skill of the propaganda machine.

Since it is quite impossible to enumerate in the space available here all the various bourgeois interpretations of the prob-

---

*First Session*, Vol. 111, Part 1, January 4, 1965, to January 27, 1965, p. 316.

lem of peaceful coexistence and ideological struggle, we shall confine our attention to just two, as being the most widespread and most extreme. One of these treats peaceful coexistence as identical with cold war, i.e., a struggle between the two ideological systems for world hegemony with no holds barred. The other takes its departure from the view that peaceful coexistence should exclude cold war, replacing it with ideological coexistence.

Both these theories distort the concepts of peaceful coexistence, cold war and ideological struggle, giving a false picture of their inter-relationship. This can easily be seen from a brief look at some of the views expounded by the adherents to each of these two interpretations.

## Peaceful Coexistence and Cold War

The imperialist bourgeoisie, irrespective of whether they regard another world war to be inevitable or accept the possibility and desirability of peaceful coexistence, generally view relations between the socialist and capitalist countries as a cold war, in which the competing ideologies strive to attain world supremacy by all and any means.

Thus, ideologists of monopoly capital generally draw no distinction between "peaceful coexistence", "the cold war" and "ideological struggle", but regard them as synonyms descriptive of the same implacable conflict between the two systems that has gone on ever since the October Revolution. However, various ideologists attribute a vastly different role to cold war in the present stage of this conflict, depending on their particular socio-political standpoint.

For the ultra-reactionary wing of the imperialist bourgeoisie, for the "hard-liners" who contemplate the possibility of a nuclear clash, the cold war is a means of increasing international tension. The West German publicist L. Schulte writes: "The war of nerves has been and remains a prelude to military conflicts."[1] The logical outcome of this course is for cold war to become hot war, by means of which the most aggressive for-

[1] L. Schulte, *Vom Blitzkrieg zum Nervenkrieg. Atlantische Partnerschaft im atomaren Zeitalter*, Boppard/Rh., 1964, S. 31.

ces of the imperialist bourgeoisie hope to turn back the wheel of history and achieve "total victory" over communism.

The more moderate sections of the imperialist bourgeoisie view cold war as a means of achieving imperialist aims without resorting to world war. In contrast to the "ultras", they "hope that the present situation will at least not change for the worst, i.e., that the cold war will continue without developing into an open conflict that could lead to the destruction of mankind".[1] The moderates are for the continuation of the arms race and the increase in "deterrent forces", and hope by means of a combination of peaceful cold war methods and "local wars" to return the peoples of the socialist countries to the capitalist fold.

Today, the ruling groups in the capitalist world are afraid to risk all-out nuclear war, and resort to other methods of achieving their imperialist aims. These methods include military blackmail and "local wars", and—one of the most important of all—ideological warfare.

Let us take a look at the theses most widely held by those bourgeois ideologists who are for stepping up the ideological struggle in conditions of peaceful coexistence. They are: a) that peaceful coexistence is cold war, involving the attainment of foreign policy aims with the aid of all sorts of ideological means; b) that given peaceful coexistence, victory will go to the side with the best-equipped ideological arsenal; c) that the West must perfect its ideological weapons and use them on an ever wider scale.

Let us now examine these theses in more detail.

*A.* Many bourgeois ideologists, being opposed to a world thermonuclear war conflict, interpret peaceful coexistence as inevitable cold war for world domination.

The defenders of capitalism generally argue along the following lines. In present conditions the two worlds are obliged to coexist in order to avoid nuclear annihilation. However, this coexistence cannot be "peaceful" in anything like the real meaning of the word, since communism is, by its very nature, "subversive", so that cold war is inevitable.[2] Similar views are expressed on the other side of the Atlantic. "In fact, we have no alternative but to engage the enemy in the psychological arena of the Cold War.... For, short of the outbreak of the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 7.

[2] *Some Reflections on British Foreign Policy*, London, 1959.

Third World War, the immediate prospect is for a continuation and intensification of the Cold War—the great and protracted psycho-political conflict."[1]

The cold war comprises all methods of struggle for world domination apart from nuclear war: the arms race, local wars, political and ideological subversion, military blackmail, the application of economic sanctions, lies and slander—in short, everything that produces international tension and, in the opinion of bourgeois ideologists, can bring pressure to bear on communism.

Most bourgeois ideologists who attribute a major role to ideological conflict between capitalism and socialism, view it not as the reflection of the class positions of the two parties, but purely as an instrument for ensuring world hegemony. In other words, they ascribe imperialist content to it.

In order to give the semblance of truth to this view, the anti-communists carry out a double manipulation. Firstly, they present the strengthening of the international positions of socialism which is dictated by the laws of history as being merely the result of "Red imperialism", interpreting the communist view of the inevitability of capitalism being superseded by socialism as "communist imperialism". Thus, Fulbright maintains that the Soviet Union is dedicated to "the imposition on an unwilling world of its own form of totalitarian society".[2] Secondly, the anti-communists represent imperialism and its struggle against social progress not as a struggle against the choice of the masses in favour of communism, but as a struggle against foreign imperialism. To cite Fulbright again: "... It is not Communism which is at issue between the Soviet Union and the West but Communist *imperialism*...."[3]

It should perhaps be pointed out that bourgeois ideologists who hold this view are regarding as imperialism not a system of socio-economic relations and the politics arising therefrom, but a social doctrine (namely, the Marxist thesis of the inevitable universal triumph of communism). They interpret a Marxist doctrine which has been proved correct by history itself as a manifestation of "communist imperialism".

The subjective-idealist approach is patently evident in this fraudulent device, an approach which regards history not in

[1] R. Strausz-Hupé, W. R. Kintner, S. T. Possony, op. cit., p. 260.

[2] William J. Fulbright, *Prospects for the West*, Cambridge-Massachusetts, 1963, p. 14.

[3] Ibid., p. 20.

terms of underlying socio-economic conditions and changing material foundations of social life, but in terms of a struggle between two ideologies—the bourgeois and the communist.

This subjective-idealist approach permits bourgeois ideologists to attain at least three major aims.

Firstly, it makes it easy to falsify the struggle between progress and reaction, and peace and aggression. For if we admit that the course of history is determined by the conflict between two opposite ideologies, it is not difficult to convince the ignorant that it is the communist ideology proving the need for changing the social order that is the "aggressive", "imperialist" ideology, and that the bourgeois ideology and politics directed towards the defence and perpetuation of capitalism are of a "defensive", "peaceful" nature. Dean Rusk declared that the "first objective of our policy towards the Communist states must be, and is, to play our part in checking Communist imperialism. This administration will vigorously oppose the expansion of the Communist domain—whoever the Communists in question may be—by force or the threat of force, whether directly or indirectly applied."[1] This provides a fine example of how sophistry and demagogy are used to make an aggressive, reactionary policy appear a "policy of peace", and brand the real struggle for social progress as imperialism.

Secondly, the subjective-idealist approach makes it easy to justify the persecution of those who hold different views. If communist ideology is declared imperialist (and it is hardly impossible to establish what influence particular ideas have), then the whole system of repression at home and constant intervention abroad can be justified as being "in the interests of security". Mr. Rusk frankly admitted that US policy was directed against ideas, against views. "Until the Communists themselves change," Rusk declared, "the most elementary security considerations demand that we remain ever alert to the dangers the very outlook on life raises for us and for others committed to freedom."[2] In this way a whole series of military, political and psychological cold war devices are justified, which, although reactionary and aggressive, are presented as necessary for the struggle with the "expansionist doctrine" of communism.

---

[1] *The Department of State Bulletin*, Vol. L, No. 1290, March 16, 1964, p. 391.

[2] Ibid., p. 392.

The third advantage of this approach is that it is extremely comforting and gives ample grounds for the reassurance the bourgeoisie so sorely need. If social development is determined by ideas formulated perfectly arbitrarily, the whole course of social evolution can be regarded as depending not on the material contradictions of social life, but on skilful propaganda, the ability to instil specially chosen ideas into the masses, to pull the wool over the eyes of the masses and produce the desired attitudes. In short, it depends on the strategy and tactics of "psychological" or cold warfare.

This indeed is the general direction of most of the recommendations made by the less subtle champions of capitalism, who advise the use of any methods whatsoever, from lies to acts of provocation, in order to achieve the desired results in the struggle with communism. Thus, the West German anti-Communist T. Arnold suggests "skilful parrying", making use of "apt comparisons", "demagogical exaggeration" (which should be "close to the truth") and direct frontal attacks.

It is perfectly clear that the bourgeois interpretation of peaceful coexistence as cold war and of the ideological conflict as a means towards world domination has nothing to do with the real interests of peace, with strengthening good-neighbourly relations between nations, or with the scientific concept of ideological struggle.

The democratic theory of peaceful coexistence and the imperialist theory of cold war are not simply different things, they are antithetical. Moreover, this reflects the divorce not only between the views of the working class and the bourgeoisie but equally that between the masses in general and the imperialist clique.

The principle of coexistence between countries with different social systems, which is supported by the masses, involves the demand for preserving peace and the implementation of a whole series of measures guaranteeing the strengthening of peace and the improvement of the international situation. Such measures include the cessation of the arms race and gradual disarmament, putting a stop to local wars launched by imperialism, the ending of military blackmail and war psychosis, the improvement of international commercial and cultural ties, and so on. All these measures are of a generally democratic nature and perfectly acceptable to capitalism. Thus, when the Communists propose them to bourgeois governments they are not suggesting that the leaders of the bourgeois world should abolish their

own system. These measures would not serve to overthrow capitalism, but merely to improve the international situation, while creating favourable conditions for social progress.

The cold war launched by imperialism, on the contrary, is an attempt to reduce peaceful coexistence to the use of every possible means of prolonging and increasing international tension without resorting to total nuclear war.

Since this leaves the arms race, local wars, nuclear blackmail, war psychosis, political subversion, economic blockade, and a whole host of other cold war tactics, the task of preserving peace in these circumstances is an extremely difficult one. Any really effective measures to strengthen peaceful coexistence and develop good-neighbourly relations are rendered quite impossible.

Naturally these two totally different approaches to peaceful coexistence involve totally different use of the means of ideological struggle. For the Communists ideological struggle is an organic part of the class struggle, reflecting the antagonism between the working class and the bourgeoisie, a means of showing the real qualities of socialism and capitalism. For the imperialist bourgeoisie, it is a means of achieving world hegemony, a means of attaining the aims of imperialist foreign policy and of conditioning public acquiescence to aggressive acts.

Thus, genuine peaceful coexistence does not mean cold war at all, but is a constructive programme for the all-round development of international ties. The aim of this programme is to exclude armed conflict and channel the historically inevitable conflict between socialism and capitalism into economic competition and ideological struggle.

*B.* In assessing the general trends of social change in the postwar period, the anti-communists generally admit that communism has achieved notable successes. To what do they attribute these successes? In full accordance with their underlying subjective-idealist approach, bourgeois ideologists regard the successes achieved by the forces of socialism as the result of a well-organised ideological struggle waged by the Communists.

In so doing they fail to distinguish between ideological struggle and propaganda warfare. In other words they are not willing to admit that it is the practical demonstration of the advantages of the existing social systems and not a comparison of abstract ideals that is involved. They treat the ideological conflict purely in terms of propaganda, as "psychological war-

fare". The successes achieved by communism are therefore almost completely divorced from socio-economic conditions, from the contradictions of concrete reality, and the causes are relegated entirely to the sphere of ideas. Two causes are most often mentioned.

One is that the Communists have made a cunning choice of ideology, "releasing" a number of "clever ideas", thereby sowing disorder in the world and causing various revolutionary changes. Thus, the American anti-Communist T. Whitney writes in his preface to the book, *The Communist Blueprint for the Future*: "One thing is clear: Marx, Engels and Lenin let loose in this world a revolution by thought and deed which is indeed remaking history."[1]

Many bourgeois ideologists attribute the successes achieved by the Communists to the fact that they possess a single ideology. The American sociologist Fred J. Cook writes that the strength of communism lies in its transformation of Marxism from a philosophy into an ideology, ensuring unity of views and certainty in the choice of ends. The English sociologist M. Shanks makes the same point in his book *The Stagnant Society*: "...In this very uniformity, in this disciplining of society to the attainment of particular social and economic goals, there is at the same time something decent, honest, and inspiring. Whatever else it lacks, this society contains within itself a sense of purpose. This, vis-à-vis the West, is the great strength."[2]

Bourgeois thinkers practically ignore the question of the relationship between ideology and life. Viewing things in terms of their own ideological armour, representing a mixture of promises, lie and demagogy, the defenders of capitalism do not even ask themselves how it is that communist ideas answer the urgent needs of the masses and take into account the objective trends of social development. For the bourgeoisie do not even recognise the existence of these inevitable trends. Thus, ascribing the successes achieved by communism entirely to the merits of its ideology instead of to socio-economic factors, bourgeois sociologists regard these merits as deriving from the unity of purpose of communist ideology, its internal organisation, and not from the fact that it corresponds to the needs of the age.

The second factor to which bourgeois ideologists ascribe the

---

[1] *The Communist Blueprint for the Future*, New York, 1962, p. XIV.
[2] Michael Shanks, *The Stagnant Society*, Baltimore, 1961, p. 15.

successes achieved by communism is skilful propaganda. Thus, R. White, an American anti-Communist, describing the delights of American capitalism, asks why it is that tens or hundreds of millions of people in other countries consider that "we capitalists are scoundrels" or "ruled" by capitalist scoundrels? For him the answer is simple: it is purely the result of communist propaganda, a world-wide communist propaganda campaign with the aim of discrediting capitalism and the USA as its chief home.

However, whatever explanations bourgeois ideologists might offer, the important thing is that the bourgeoisie recognises the superiority of communist ideas, and regards their spread as a mortal danger. They are well aware that the results of the ideological conflict (or, as they would have it, the "psychological war") have so far been by no means comforting for them.

It is this, the fact that capitalism loses to socialism in the conditions of peaceful coexistence, that explains the unwillingness to accept the policy of peaceful coexistence proposed by the Communists.

While recognising the successes of communism, bourgeois ideology is unable to accept the fact that these successes are the outcome of historical development and social progress, the result of objective laws of history, and not of a cunningly chosen idea and a cleverly organised "psychological war". The course of history is not determined by "clever ideas": the objective laws of history condition the growing influence of ideas that encourage progress and the declining influence of the ideas of the moribund class.

Even some of the ideologists who are far from accepting Marxist views have gradually come to recognise this. They note the growing popularity of communism as the bearer of progress. Thus, the American publicist W. Manger remarks à propos the situation in Latin America: "One of the greatest tragedies of the current era is that our ideological opponents should have been permitted to replace us in the imagination of so many of the Latin American people; to have created the impression in their minds that it is they, not we, who are the advocates of peace, the champions of democracy, the defenders of individual rights and the friend of the oppressed and the downtrodden."[1]

At the same time there is a growing awareness and recogni-

[1] William Manger, *Pan America in Crisis. The Future of the OAS*, Washington, 1961, p. 6.

tion of the fact that the capitalist world appears as the centre of reaction and the bulwark of counter-revolution. The American sociologist H. C. Aubrey writes: "Whether one likes it or not, the United States ... is often being tagged as a 'conservative' power, the friend and ally of regimes that oppose change."[1] Symptomatic in this respect are the many admissions made by Arnold Toynbee in his book, *America and the World Revolution*, where he states that America today is the leader of a world-wide anti-revolutionary movement in defence of vested interests.

Naturally, such admissions do not mean that capitalism no longer has the support of its ideologists. It is simply that the champions of capitalism are forced to make a reasonably sober assessment of the actual situation if they are to be able to choose the best "courses of action" in the ideological conflict. Nevertheless, such admissions are highly significant: when the champions of capitalism begin to openly admit defeats, the outlook for capitalism is none too bright.

*C.* Admitting communist successes and capitalist defeats, the ideologists of the imperialist bourgeoisie press for a reversal of this situation. However, failing to recognise the objective laws of social development and the objective impossibility of the bourgeoisie being able to defend the non-existent advantages of their system, in short, failing to recognise the historical bankruptcy of their own ideas and ideals, bourgeois ideologists ascribe their defeats to failure to make good use of the opportunities of ideological struggle. To reassure their class that the causes of failure are to be sought in minor ideological shortcomings rather than in the inherent defects of capitalism which the bourgeoisie are powerless to abolish, bourgeois ideologists are again concentrating on the shortcomings in bourgeois ideology and propaganda instead of on the real contradictions of social life.

They adopt a subjective-idealist approach both in explaining their defeats and in the search for a solution, and suggest that the main trouble is that the West lacks a single common ideal (implying that everything will be all right once such an ideal is found). Thus, the American anti-Communist Fertig writes in *Prosperity through Freedom* that communism flourishes where there is no strong opposing ideal to offset it, such as a powerful

---

[1] H. C. Aubrey, *Coexistence: Economic Challenge and Response*, Washington, 1962, p. 9.

religious force, or intense and unified nationalism, or a vigorous libertarianism, and that where such ideals do not exist, all the money in the world will not prevent the growth of communism. M. Shanks writes about the Western world as rich and exciting, "but seemingly incapable of concentrating its energies on a positive social pattern. The whole Western world, in varying degrees, stands in need of a new dynamic, a new sense of social purpose.... And among the industrial powers this lack seems to be most acutely felt here in Britain...".[1] Numerous other bourgeois ideologists join the chorus, bemoaning the absence in the West of dynamism and purpose, and the general feeling of disarray and lack of direction that finds expression in the appeal for an ideal to oppose communism.

Having diagnosed the trouble as being the unity and dynamism of communist ideology as opposed to the heterogeneity and passiveness of bourgeois ideology, the physicians of capitalism prescribe the panacea of improvement and activisation of bourgeois ideology.

But they do not agree when it comes to the actual remedy to be prescribed. Some feel that bourgeois ideology should be brought up to date, others hold that it is the tactics employed in the ideological struggle that should be altered, others are for a combination of both.

The many bourgeois ideologists who propose a single common "Western ideal" to counter the "communist menace" are forgetting that this is quite impossible. Bourgeois ideology is unable to offer either progressive ideas or a general common doctrine for the simple reason that the bourgeoisie is divided into numerous antagonistic groups with mutually exclusive standpoints.

Another question of no small interest to the anti-Communists is that of acquiring more "living space" for their ideas by advancing them beyond the "Iron Curtain". An important role here is played by the theory of "erosion of communism", taking the war into the opponents' territory, the concept of "equalising the chances" of capitalism and socialism, in short, the concept of ideological subversion in the socialist countries.

Bourgeois ideologists totally ignore the socio-economic reasons for the spread of certain ideas and believe that they can achieve great success merely by ensuring the penetration of bourgeois ideas into the socialist countries. They claim that

[1] Michael Shanks, op. cit., p. 17.

simply by striking a few successful psychological blows at the enemy on his own ground they can achieve tremendous successes for the "Free World" and thus propose the "opening up" of "closed communist societies" and the "dethroning" of Marxism-Leninism.

That these hopes are quite futile is not only due to the fact that the socialist countries are carefully guarding the interests of the working people. The point is that the numerous proposals made by bourgeois politicians and ideologists are based on the fundamental misconception that the course of history is determined by the choice of ideas and the ability to instil them in the masses. It is a grave mistake to accord such exaggerated importance to ideas. This is not to say that ideas are not tremendously important, today more than ever before. But the ideas around which a social conflict centres are not the arbitrary choice of ideologists: they are the reflection of socio-economic class interests, an expression of certain social tendencies.

The successes of communist ideology are not due to the founders of Marxism-Leninism having created a "convenient", "unified" system of ideas and views, but to the fact that these views represent essential needs of social development, that they form the "true slogan" of a struggle already being waged, that they reflect and take into account the objective trends of social development, which, quite independently of the wishes of any particular social groups, will lead, sooner or later, to the replacement of capitalism by socialism. It is possible to reject communist ideas, to dispute the view of social development they represent. But this cannot serve more than a limited propaganda purpose: it will not affect in the slightest the general course of historical development, which will confirm time and again the correctness of Marxism-Leninism and the unsoundness of bourgeois forecasts, leading to increasing defection from the ranks of bourgeois ideology and conversion to the ideology of the proletariat.

This process will obviously not be a regular, straightforward one. Bourgeois ideology and its propaganda machine exert a powerful influence on the masses. By spreading lies and slander, and combining truth with half-truths, they are in a position to retain their influence over a number of people for a time. But bourgeois society is rent by antagonisms. The gulf between the two main classes—the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—is especially great. The conditions thus exist in capi-

talist society for propagating the ideology of the working class—Marxism-Leninism.

In the socialist world, on the other hand, socio-economic conditions for the propagation of bourgeois ideas are non-existent, since there are no social groups or classes whose interests these ideas would represent. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that ideas are to some extent independent of socio-economic conditions, the bourgeois intentions to sow confusion in the minds of the working people of the socialist countries should by no means be ignored and dismissed as totally ineffectual. Insistent propagation of bourgeois ideas can have its effects and this makes it essential for us to make a careful examination and criticism of bourgeois theories within the "frontiers of communism".

Communists reject the bourgeois concept of ideological conflict as part of the cold war: they regard the struggle between the proletarian and bourgeois ideologies as a reflection of the competition between two qualitatively different socio-economic systems, and the proletariat's struggle against the bourgeoisie as a means of demonstrating the advantages of socialism, as a condition for ensuring free choice by the masses of the social system that best satisfies their needs. Communists have no reason to be afraid of the ideological conflict, for only socialism and communism satisfy the true interests of the working masses, and only Marxist-Leninist ideology signposts the way to a society in keeping with the aspirations of the vast majority of mankind.

## Peaceful Coexistence and Ideological Reconciliation

Many middle-class people today, representatives of the petty and middle bourgeoisie, support peaceful coexistence not as cold war but as "ideological reconciliation". These social groups and their ideologists are prepared to accept peaceful coexistence provided it involves neither cold war nor ideological conflict: they are for "ideological coexistence".

Thus, the German sociologist A. Buchholz writes: "A political peace without a spiritual peace is always temporary".[1] The British Labour MP Christopher Mayhew was maintaining the

[1] A. Buchholz, *Der Kampf um die bessere Welt*, Stuttgart, 1961, S. 50.

same when he insisted that a condition for peaceful coexistence is "ideological coexistence", "an end to the outdated, bitter propaganda battle between so-called capitalism and so-called communism".[1]

There naturally exist numerous shades of opinion among the supporters of this theory too. We are faced with a vast number of theories, approaches, solutions and proposals, corresponding to the political and personal views of their authors. Thus, in examining the essence of the general view in question, we can only limit ourselves to some of the more widespread and fully expounded viewpoints. These are: a) the view that the ideological struggle is temporary and will cease at some point during the subsequent evolution of capitalism and communism; b) the view that the ideological conflict is incompatible with peaceful coexistence and should therefore give way to ideological peace.

Let us proceed to analyse each of these concepts in turn.

*A.* Some of the bourgeois ideologists who consider peace to be of paramount importance regard the ideological conflict as the product of the present aspirations of communism and capitalism, as an accompanying feature of the present temporary phase of peaceful coexistence, and thus destined to cease in time.

One of the main works in support of this view is *The Struggle for a Better World* by A. Buchholz. Viewing the present course of history in terms of the struggle between capitalism and communism, Buchholz writes: "Here two life principles confront one another which are mutually exclusive, yet at the same time both aim at universal spread."[2] He rejects the idea that these two principles can be reconciled by any form of agreement or compromise. "No 'agreement' can be reached between the two principles existing in East and West simply through negotiations or compromises."[3] He is far from presenting the Communists simply as a band of evil conspirators, and recognises that "the supporters of this ideology are convinced that they are fighters for a better world, and consider it only a matter of time before the whole world becomes communist. Connected with this is the conviction that a law of history leads to communism. . . ."[4]

---

[1] *The Guardian*, Nov. 7, 1961, p. 1.
[2] A. Buchholz, op. cit., p. 50.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid., p. 15.

Buchholz bases his attitude to peaceful coexistence and the ideological conflict on this basically sound appraisal of the situation. He holds that in present conditions, when both capitalism and communism have "global pretensions", peaceful coexistence is not firmly established, but is accompanied by profound distrust of the other side. In his view, peaceful coexistence today is "a dangerous balance between the need for peace, the aims of world communism and a more or less defined global claim to freedom. Behind all this lies profound distrust of the other side."[1]

This mutual distrust can only be overcome and peaceful coexistence be firmly established provided that a state of "ideological peace" is brought about between the two conflicting principles. For the time being this is impossible since "spiritual peace can only be attained when a spiritual basis, lying deeper than the contradictions that are visible today, is discovered and mentally assimilated".[2]

How can this be achieved?

Unlike most other bourgeois ideologists, Buchholz treats ideological principles as reflecting certain social needs, albeit somewhat superficially. "For the time being the principles of the West and of communist ideology are in a state of uncompromising conflict, which can be expected to grow even fiercer since communist ideology is now directed towards the satisfaction of certain needs of the world that lies ahead of us, while the West is hardly facing the problems of the future. This imbalance explains the mutual distrust."[3]

Failing to see the conflict of class interests that lies behind this conflict of ideas, Buchholz treats the present struggle between the two ideologies as a temporary phenomenon, relating only to the present stage of the relations between capitalism and communism. He considers that the struggle is at present inevitable, but that in the future, when a balance of needs and interests is achieved, the mutual distrust will disappear, a common ideological foundation will be created, and peace will be firmly established. Thus, according to Buchholz, "the spiritual polemic between East and West is an inevitable gateway beyond which lies the road to a better future".[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 53.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid., p. 10.
[4] Ibid.

The utopian nature of such views is quite plain. Ideology is the expression of basic class interests, so that, however much the international situation may change, whatever alterations there may be in the relationship of forces in the international arena, the ideology of the working class and that of the bourgeoisie will remain implacably hostile to one another. Neither circumstances nor time can reconcile them, for the interests of the exploiters and the interests of the exploited, the interests of capitalist and worker, are irreconcilable.

Certainly, it is true to say that a change in the relationship of world forces influences the course of the ideological conflict. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the imperialist bourgeoisie's hopes of achieving a military victory over communism are vain, and this serves to undermine the positions of the "ultras" and detract from the popularity of their ultra-reactionary ideology, causing more and more bourgeois to support the principle of peaceful coexistence upheld by the Communists. But the fact that both Communists and some bourgeois ideologists have a common commitment to peace and peaceful coexistence does not mean "ideological peace", for the interests and ideology of the working class and the bourgeoisie remain as mutually exclusive and irreconcilable as ever.

*B.* Some ideologists of the middle bourgeoisie, and especially the social-reformists, while recognising the desirability of peaceful coexistence, maintain that ideological conflict is incompatible with true coexistence which requires ideological peace.

A most forthright expression of the conception of "ideological coexistence" is to be found in an article in the press and a brochure by the British Labour MP Christopher Mayhew.[1]

Basically, Mr. Mayhew's view is as follows: "Cold war is better than hot war: and competitive coexistence is better than cold war. But competitive coexistence is in itself an inferior conception, unsuited to the new age which we are now entering."[2] What does Mr. Mayhew find so eminently unsatisfactory about this conception? In his view, the present communist conception of peaceful coexistence is disruptive and dangerous, since while it rejects the assumption that war is inevitable it does not preclude a fierce struggle against capitalism. Mr.

[1] C. Mayhew, "Coexistence—the West's Answer", *The Guardian*, November 7, 1961, p. 9, and *Coexistence Plus. A Positive Approach to World Peace*, London, 1962.

[2] This and the following quotations, unless otherwise stated, are from the brochure.

Mayhew's brochure is an attempt to point out, in particular, that "the ideological struggle on which this conception insists is sterile and meaningless and poisons East-West relations".[1]

Mayhew bases his argument on the assertion that it is meaningless to speak of a Communist World and a Capitalist World. "This communist-capitalist propaganda struggle is based on increasingly unreal assumptions—in particular the assumption that the ideologies of the world can be divided into two groups and that these two groups can be neatly labelled 'communist' and 'capitalist' (or 'free').'"[2]

This view is not a new one, but it is no more convincing for its age. No one is trying to dispute the perfectly obvious fact that "the ideologies and social systems of the world are extremely varied". But it is equally incorrect to go to the opposite extreme, as Mayhew does, echoing several of his colleagues in the Labour Party—like Richard Crossland and John Strachey—and suggest that "capitalism has become socialism", that "this variety is increasing, on both sides of the Iron Curtain; that capitalist-type freedom is increasing in some communist countries, and communist-type planning in some capitalist countries; and that, in fact, the whole conception of a clear-cut 'communism' confronting a clear-cut 'capitalism' across an unbridgeable gulf is increasingly unscientific and will soon become obviously absurd".[3]

This is simply a new variation on the popular theme of crossing capitalism with socialism to produce a "hybrid society".

Mayhew does not limit himself to generalisations, but expounds his views in detail, comparing them point by point with the corresponding Marxist interpretation. In so doing he comes across what he considers to be three false premises. It should perhaps be mentioned here in this connection, that Mr. Mayhew is not overscrupulous about presenting his opponents' standpoint accurately.

One of these premises he holds up for criticism concerns the social structure of the present-day world. "The first of these assumptions is that there are only two basic ideologies or social systems."[4] Mayhew emphatically rejects this. "Military power is polarised in the world, but social systems are not; and the communist thesis that they are is a typical error of Marxist

[1] Ibid., p. 1.
[2] Ibid., p. 2.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid., p. 9.

dialectical thinking, with its consuming passion for arbitrary division by two. In fact, of course, the social systems of the world are extremely varied, and the variety is increasing."[1]

Mayhew's reference to the dialectic can hardly be said to make his ideas more credible. For a start, the Communists have never had a particular passion for "arbitrary division by two" and, moreover, they have never disputed the fact that there are other social systems in the world besides socialism and capitalism, systems that combine elements of feudalism and capitalism, or primitive tribal society and capitalism, as can be clearly seen from a look at the social structure of many African states.

But the true task of science is not to make an inventory of all the social systems existing in the world and note how varied they are, but to determine the essence of the major socio-economic systems and the main direction of social development. If one approaches the matter from this point of view, it is only by deliberately turning a blind eye to the facts or distorting them that one can deny that socialism and capitalism are the major social systems in the world today, and that it is the conflict between them—economic, political and ideological—that is the chief factor underlying social development.

Indeed, this is admitted not only by the Communists: it is a basic premise of all frankly bourgeois ideology. Naturally, the social-reformists are loth to admit it, since it would be tantamount to an admission of the unsoundness of their whole policy of reconciling class antagonisms and subduing the working class to the bourgeoisie. But this does not give them *carte blanche* for manipulating the facts as they please and presenting a picture of reality that suits the conception of their choice. One cannot play about with facts with impunity: life has a nasty habit of taking revenge on those who do.

Another premise, or as he calls it "assumption", that Mayhew attacks concerns the differences between communism and capitalism. "The second false assumption is that the gulf between 'communism' and 'capitalism' is unbridgeable."[2] In his opinion, "the gulf between most communist and non-communist countries is undoubtedly narrowing and will probably continue to narrow further in the years ahead".[3]

What does Mayhew refer to in support of this view? Once

---

[1] C. Mayhew, op. cit., p. 10.
[2] Ibid., p. 13.
[3] Ibid., p. 14.

again, he is remarkably unoriginal, adducing such "similarities" as socialist planning and capitalist state regulation of the economy, the existence of profit in both socialist and capitalist economy, commodity production in the socialist countries, and so on.

But these arguments are all rather vague and carry little weight. The existence of not one or two, but even dozens of formally similar phenomena in capitalist and socialist society does not alter in the slightest the fact that the basic social features of the two systems are diametrically opposed. They will continue to be opposed for the simple reason that the development of the two systems is not movement along two separate courses gradually drawing closer and closer together, but the revolutionary transition of one into the other, of capitalism into socialism.

If we accept, as we must, that ownership of the means of production forms the basis of social relations, how can we deny that public ownership in socialist society and private capitalist ownership in bourgeois society are diametrically opposed in their essence, social role, and the nature of the social relations based on them? It is on these directly opposite forms of ownership that the directly opposite social and political systems of capitalism and socialism rest. The presence of certain features common to the two is due partly to the fact that communism is not yet sufficiently mature and is making use in the first phase of its development of economic categories inherited from the preceding stage, capitalism, imbuing them with new content—categories such as "commodity", "money", "profit", etc., and partly to the fact that in the capitalist system, growing centralisation and concentration of production has made necessary a certain amount of state control bearing a similarity to planning, state interference in the economy and so on.

This does not mean that capitalism and socialism are drawing together: it merely shows that the material-economic prerequisites for the new society are maturing in the depths of present-day capitalist production. As history advances and communism develops, the difference between communism and capitalism will increase, while the revolutionary process of the transformation of capitalism into socialism will develop more and more rapidly.

Non-Marxists, with their idealist outlook, cannot or will not understand that the ideological struggle is the inevitable reflection of the class conflict engendered by socio-economic con-

tradictions. It cannot be brought to an end at will, for it is not brought about and kept going by the evil intrigues of revolutionaries, it is not imposed on mankind by the Communists: it is simply a historically necessary social product. Class society has been in existence for thousands of years, and throughout these millennia the class conflict has continued in its basic forms—the economic, political and ideological. Not only did it begin long before the Communists came on the scene: it began long before there was even such a thing as a working class, or capitalism. Capitalist society engendered the class conflict, including the ideological struggle, between the working class and the bourgeoisie.

Obviously the ideological struggle is waged consciously, and is controlled by people, but its historical necessity and inevitability remain the decisive factor.

Expounding his conception of ideological coexistence, Mayhew advances two arguments in its favour.

The first argument is that the ideological struggle is an obstacle to peaceful coexistence, and prevents co-operation between the socialist and the capitalist countries.

The idea that the ideological struggle—"the ideological myths"—lies at the root of international tension and is the chief obstacle to peace and disarmament runs like a scarlet thread through the whole brochure. Mayhew calls upon the countries of the world "to abandon their foolish capitalist-communist propaganda struggle, and learn to tolerate each other's ideas and institutions".[1] This appeal is directed particularly to the socialist countries, and referring to the Communists, Mayhew writes: "But why, if they feel that friendship and co-operation are desirable at the interstate level, do they not take the next logical step and accept ideological coexistence as well?"[2] In his opinion, "if the Communists insist on imposing an ideological struggle on the world, the possibilities of friendly co-operation are limited".[3]

We need hardly return to the fact that the Communists do not impose the ideological struggle on the world. Let us instead pause for a moment to examine Mayhew's thesis that the ideological struggle hinders the possibility of friendly co-operation.

---

[1] C. Mayhew, op. cit., p. 2.
[2] Ibid., p. 16.
[3] Ibid., p. 15.

Mayhew is one of those ideologists who regard the ideological struggle as an important instrument of cold war, as an instrument for increasing international tension. He, like so many others, tends to forget that this is only one interpretation of its essence and role, that it is by no means the only one. They go on from there to represent the Communists, who recognise the inevitability of the ideological struggle, as advocates of cold war and international tension.

But the Communists have always insisted on the fundamental difference between cold war as a means of maintaining and increasing international tension, and ideological struggle as a means of expressing class standpoints. The Communists reject cold war and hold that it can be brought to an end. But they insist that the ideological struggle cannot be brought to an end as long as there exist antagonistic classes. Therefore, any attempt to accuse the Communists of stirring up war hysteria on the grounds that they insist on the inevitability of the ideological struggle and wage that struggle is completely unfounded, and can only be put down either to ignorance of the elementary principles of communism or to deliberate falsification.

Mayhew's second argument in favour of ideological coexistence is that "besides being unscientific and dangerous, the ideological struggle is also expensive".[1]

As for the ideological struggle being unscientific, Mr. Mayhew does not make it at all clear what he means by this sweeping statement. If he means that it is "unlawful", we have already discussed that question earlier. If he means that "unscientific" ways and means are used in the struggle, then we have a subject for discussion.

In this question we come up against the qualitatively different character of Marxist and bourgeois ideology—the former, progressive and scientific, and the latter, reactionary and unscientific. This predetermines the means by which each of these ideologies tries to win people's minds. The Communists have always been firmly opposed to the use of falsehood, slander, distortion of facts, and other such methods employed by bourgeois ideology in the struggle with its rivals, against sordid devices such as are used by bourgeois propaganda to pull the wool over the eyes of the man in the street. The Communists have always stressed the need for waging the ideological struggle by fair means, which is perfectly understandable since they

[1] Ibid., p. 19.

know that their ideas represent the interests of the masses and are confirmed by history. It is because bourgeois interests are reactionary that the bourgeois ideologists have to resort to falsehood, in the form of lies, half-truths and distortions of the truth in order to win the support of the masses, for there is no other way open to them today to justify their reactionary interests and aims. Thus, while holding it necessary to expose the falsehood of bourgeois ideology, the Communists have no illusions as to the possibility of the latter being any other than what it is.

As for the "expense" involved, although the bourgeoisie might express occasional annoyance at it being so "unwarranted", this does not prevent them from meeting it. The bourgeoisie is perfectly aware that it is thanks to their ideological influence that the exploiters are able to maintain their hold over the masses, and most of the appeals for a reduction of expenditure on the struggle that are heard from time to time in the bourgeois camp are purely rhetorical. Whether Mr. Mayhew likes it or not, the ideological struggle cannot be excluded from social life.

What positive programme does Mr. Mayhew offer for ensuring peace? He expresses the opinion that "three vital things" must be added to the Marxist conception of peaceful coexistence: "ideological coexistence, an end to the outdated, bitter propaganda battle between so-called 'capitalism' and so-called 'communism'"; "genuinely free East-West contacts"; and "active co-operation, instead of sterile rivalry, between communist and non-communist governments".[1]

As for the first "plus", namely, "ideological coexistence", we have already examined it, and shown how it is not only unacceptable to Communists, but is a physical impossibility.

As for the second, if Mr. Mayhew means co-operation on the basis of equal rights and mutual benefit, the Communists have never had any objections. On the contrary, it was they who kept on insisting that peaceful coexistence must mean not just the absence of war, but all-round active co-operation in trade, culture and science between countries with different social systems. It was the imperialists, not the Communists, who imposed sanctions on trade with the socialist countries, it is the US imperialists who are trying to impose a blockade on Cuba, it is the bourgeois governments that are unwilling to co-operate

[1] C. Mayhew, op. cit., p. 1.

with the socialist countries on a programme of controlled disarmament. One could go on and on. Mr. Mayhew's second appeal is thus clearly addressed to the wrong side.

The genuine "free contacts" Mr. Mayhew intends is the advancement of bourgeois ideas within the frontiers of communism. He admits this quite frankly when he writes (in his article in *The Guardian*) that the most important task facing non-Communists like himself today is to encourage communist countries to continue along the path of "revisionism" towards a conception of peaceful coexistence appropriate to the nuclear age.[1]

This completely contradicts all the "arguments" in favour of "ideological coexistence". For to support the dissemination of such ideas is none other than to engage in the ideological struggle which Mr. Mayhew hypocritically claims to be opposed to.

Upon closer examination, therefore, the conception of "ideological coexistence" proves to be no more than a means of "ideological appeasement" of the Communists by submitting them to bourgeois ideas.

The Communists have never agreed, and never shall agree to this kind of "free contacts". The bourgeoisie and their hirelings may be worried about the paucity of opportunities for propagating their ideas in the socialist countries, but they need not expect the Communists to facilitate their task for them by agreeing to "ideological coexistence" thereby clearing the ground for the dissemination of bourgeois ideas where communist ideology now holds sway.

* * *

The tendency to regard the ideological struggle as a major means of combating communism runs like a scarlet thread through all the various bourgeois views on the subject of peaceful coexistence and the ideological struggle, and one of the chief objectives is ideological disarmament of the Communists.

It is fairly obvious why. Ascribing to ideas a decisive role in shaping the course of history, bourgeois ideologists believe that by "disarming" the Communists in the ideological field, they can win the ideological struggle and thereby alter the actual

[1] *The Guardian*, Nov. 7, 1961.

course of social development, which is definitely not to the advantage of the bourgeoisie.

However, this strategy is fundamentally unsound and cannot possibly work, since it is based on the fallacious subjective-idealist concept of historical development, which greatly exaggerates the role of the ideological struggle, viewing it as the determinant factor. In point of fact, the ideological struggle is but the spiritual reflection of the material struggle of social forces, the class conflict. It is objective material tendencies which determine the direction of social development, and condition the clash of social forces, including its reflection—the ideological struggle. Thus, whether bourgeois ideologists like it or not, peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems of necessity involves social struggle in all its forms, except that of armed struggle between the socialist and capitalist countries. In other words, peaceful coexistence always has been and remains class conflict waged in various forms, including that of ideological struggle.

## Chapter XV

# MODERN CATHOLICISM AND PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE

The views of the Catholic hierarchy, not only on religion but also on major socio-political issues of our time are constantly impressed on believers from the pulpit and through religious literature. These opinions are frequently advanced as dogma, binding on all Catholics. It is no wonder, therefore, that the bourgeois reactionaries should invoke the support of the Catholic Church, which has always been their willing accomplice.

After the Second World War, the Catholic hierarchy in capitalist countries used their influence over the faithful to lend support to the aggressive policy of the imperialists. This was a continuation of the line the Vatican took during the war when it gave *de facto* support to the nazi coalition. In the immediate post-war years the pastors gave their blessing to nuclear weapons, especially while the United States still had the monopoly of the atom bomb. The Vatican made it quite clear that it did not consider it sinful to use nuclear weapons against the socialist countries. However, the militant churchmen took good care to play up to the longing of the peoples for peace, and tried to present preparation for nuclear war as being in the interests of preserving peace.

The arguments employed were the following. Firstly, war was regarded as just and necessary for the defence of the faith from the threat of communism. At a session of the Catholic Academy of Bavaria in February 1959, a Jesuit priest, Gund-

lach, former adviser to Pope Pius XII, declared that there are some values for the defence of which it is permissible and not immoral to use nuclear weapons.[1] According to him, a nuclear war waged on behalf of "Christian" values is moral and theologically justified.[2] By "Christian values" he means the capitalist system and its institutions, which the Church has a vested interest in preserving and strengthening.

Secondly, statesmen were absolved from all responsibility for causing a nuclear war. Gundlach assured them that God would assume full responsibility. In his zeal to justify nuclear war, he cynically declared: "Even if the world should thereby be destroyed, this would not be a valid argument against our argumentation. For, to begin with, we are absolutely certain that the world will not last eternally, and moreover, the end of the world is not our responsibility. We can therefore say that the Lord, who through His Providence has let us reach a situation where we are bound to give this testimony of our fidelity to the order He has ordained, will likewise assume the responsibility."[3]

Thirdly, these clerical apologists of nuclear war obliterate the distinction between conventional and nuclear weapons, and insist that there is no reason why the Church should revise its traditional attitude to war. Thus, we find in the American Jesuit journal *America* a criticism of those theologists who oppose the application of traditional Christian doctrines to nuclear war on the grounds that such a war is totally different from a war with bows and arrows for forgetting that it is no longer a question of defence from the Christian Tzar of Russia.[4] The journal considered the use of any weapons of mass destruction to be perfectly permissible in a war against the Soviet Union.

This view is also defended by the West German churchman Schardt, who maintains that "the development of military techniques does not make killing people any more sinful and is not a reason for regarding this power or the use of force as an evil in itself".[5]

These views are attacked even by Catholic theologists opposed

---

[1] *Documents. Revue des questions allemandes*, Paris, 1959, No. 3, p. 283.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] See *America*, March 17, 1962, p. 781.
[5] *Rheinischer Merkur*, October 17, 1958.

to nuclear war. Thus, the authors of *Nuclear Weapons and Christian Conscience* write that the H-bomb differs from all other weapons in that it is intended for mass destruction and is therefore amoral. There is no defence against it and the strategy of retaliation cannot be regarded as an effective theory of defence.[1]

Another thesis used to justify nuclear war was the argument that it was "the lesser of two evils", the other being communism. This was the view expressed by Pella, a leading member of the Italian Christian-Democratic Party, quoted as saying: "The nuclear destruction of Italy is preferable to a communist victory."[2]

Professor Correa de Oliveiro of the Catholic University of Sao Paolo argued in favour of this view in the newspaper *Catolicismo*: "It may well come to pass that one or several Western nations will be obliged to choose between two worlds, i.e., between modern war inside or outside their country, conventional war or nuclear war, with all its horrors, and recognition of a communist regime. In that case we should choose the lesser evil.... Loss of faith is a greater evil even than the possibility of annihilation through nuclear war."[3]

An extremely hostile attitude to communism and the socialist countries was largely responsible for the bellicose views of clerical ideologists, who dreamed of a new Crusade against the socialist world. These views were supported by the Holy See and during the pontificate of Pius XII, the Vatican's stand on questions of war and peace was identical with that of aggressive forces in the USA and other capitalist countries. Pope Pius XII and his intimates were prepared to give their blessing to any weapon that would be directed against communism. The faithful were insistently prevailed upon to believe that the victory of communism would mean the destruction of Christianity and a nuclear war would thus be a war in the defence of the Faith.

At the same time it was insisted that atheism was the main cause of increasing international tension. Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, declared that: "Authentic coexistence would be possible only if Communism renounced atheistic

---

[1] *Nuclear Weapons and Christian Conscience*, London, 1961, p. 33.

[2] *L'Unità*, April 6, 1959, p. 1.

[3] Quoted in *World Marxist Review: Problems of Peace and Socialism*, August, 1965, No. 8, p. 53.

materialism and the anti-religious policies deriving therefrom."[1]

The clerical ideologists identified atheism with amorality. In *Dictionary of Moral Theology* we find this statement: "Atheism is the denial of the existence of God; and since God is the basis of the metaphysical postulate of the moral order, atheism also implies a denial of morality."[2] From this it is inferred that it is impossible to base relations with socialist countries on principles of morality and law, and that peaceful coexistence between the socialist and capitalist countries is thus out of the question.

In the justification of nuclear war various religious conceptions of war are adduced which help the bourgeoisie conceal from the masses the aims of aggressive wars, their class content and their connection with the policies of the exploiter classes. Religious ideologists tend to make a great mystery of war, its nature and causes. They present it as a manifestation of Divine Providence, deriving above all from man's sinfulness, from "original sin". "Wars are the mysteries of history: they break out for complex and often incontrollable reasons."[3]

It would be wrong, however, in examining the position of the Catholic Church over issues of war and peace, to overlook the fact that the views of the hierarchy differ considerably from those of many of the ordinary clergy. Part of the Church hierarchy are closely connected with capitalist ruling classes and support the policies of the latter, who are only too pleased to have religious camouflage for their aggressive plans. This is particularly the case in the USA and West Germany. The lower clergy, who have greater contact with the mass of the faithful, are mostly for peace, as indeed are certain members of the Church hierarchy who take a realistic view of the present world situation.

Moreover, the Church is not only the higher and lower clergy: it is also millions of believers who, while accepting religion, reject the policy of preparing nuclear war.

A great change in the attitude of the Catholic Church to questions of war and peace took place during the pontificate of Pope John XXIII, when the Vatican began to condemn the

---

[1] *The Pilot*, May 7, 1960, p. 8.
[2] *Dictionary of Moral Theology*, Westminster, Maryland, 1962, p. 104.
[3] *Idea*, Rome, No. 10, October 1961, p. 654.

policy of preparing nuclear war and to disassociate itself from the aggressive forces of imperialism.

Far-sighted Church leaders saw the danger of support for the nuclear warmongers as compromising the Church in the eyes of the faithful, and felt the time had come to revise Vatican policy with regard to questions of war and peace. This change took place under the impact of tremendous social changes, above all a great upswing in the power of the forces of peace and socialism, and also reflected the attitude of those sections of the bourgeoisie who felt nuclear war to be contrary to their interests. The Main Document adopted by the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in 1969 noted that the "contradictions are also growing deeper within the ruling circles of the imperialist countries, between the most belligerent groups who gamble on extreme measures, on war, and those who, reckoning with the new relationship of class forces in the world, the growing might of the socialist countries, tend to take a more realistic approach to international problems and to solve them in the spirit of peaceful coexistence between states with different systems".[1]

But the main thing that forced the Vatican to change its stand was pressure from the mass of the faithful.

The change was part of the general evolution of Catholicism, the process of its "revival" and adaptation to modern conditions. Church ideologists were forced to recognise the fact that the Church was losing its hold on the masses, which was certainly due partly to the stand of the Church hierarchy on questions of war and peace and its negative attitude to the policy of peaceful coexistence. A profound religious crisis is shaking the time-hallowed religious conceptions of the Catholic Church and several other Churches and religions. In the interests of "revival", the Catholic Church is forced to renounce some of its traditions and rulings that people find unacceptable today.

Numerous Church leaders in the capitalist countries speak out in support of peace, and the number has greatly increased of those who do not limit themselves to uttering platitudes but take an active part in the peace movement of the masses.

At the same time another tendency is still to be noted in

---

[1] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 18.

religious organisations in bourgeois countries, again expressed both in words and deeds, and that is the tendency to propagate war and support the policies of the imperialist powers as truly "Christian". This tendency of part of the Church hierarchy widens the gap between the leaders of the Church and the faithful, aggravating the contradiction between them.

Pope John XXIII's declarations on peace, and in particular the Encyclical "Mater et Magistra", aroused great interest all over the world. This letter, which taken as a whole represented an appeal for peace, contained statements which, although perhaps less categorically than in the past, nevertheless asserted the old idea of Pax christianae. Take the following, for example: "The absence of mutual trust is explained by the fact that men, especially those who shoulder the most responsibility, are inspired in their activity by different or radically opposed outlooks on life. Some of these outlooks, unfortunately do not recognise the existence of a moral order, transcendental, universal, absolute, equal and valid for all. There is thus no possibility of meeting and understanding one another in the light of a single law of justice admitted and followed by all."[1]

In ascribing international tension to mutual distrust, the Encyclical insists that only one side is to blame, the side that does not accept the moral order proclaimed by the Church. This clearly implies the Soviet Union. The Encyclical regards the difference between the morality of the two systems, rather than the aggressive policy of imperialism, as the reason for the conflict between them. Its authors approached war purely in terms of moral criteria. While indicating the danger of nuclear war, it does not call for a struggle against that danger.

In later statements Pope John XXIII renounced the thesis that atheism was to blame for international tension.

The Church's new course with regard to peace was patent in Pope John's Encyclical "Pacem in Terris" (Peace on Earth).[2]

The Pope decided that differences in social systems were not to be seen as an obstacle to peaceful coexistence. He renounced the conception of Pax christianae preached by his predecessor, according to which war was regarded mainly as a Divine punishment and the result of growing lack of faith and the abandonment of religion. This conception not only rejected the

---

[1] *La Civiltà Cattolica*, August 5, 1961, Vol. III, p. 267.
[2] Ibid., April 20, 1963, p. 129.

possibility of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems: it also served to justify aggressive war against the socialist countries.

Pope John's Encyclical was addressed not only to the clergy and Christians all over the world, but to all men of good will. The Pope called for an end to the arms race, and disarmament under effective international control. "Justice, wisdom and humanity demand that the arms race be stopped; that existing arms be simultaneously and reciprocally reduced; that nuclear weapons be banned; and that disarmament be finally effected by general agreement under a system of effective controls."

The Pope rejected the theory of "the balance of fear", which some churchmen were in favour of. "It has become customary to justify the arms race on the grounds that peace is only possible today if it is based on the balance of forces. Thus, if one political community arms itself, other political communities must keep up and arm themselves too. And if one political community produces atomic weapons, the others must also produce atomic weapons of equal destructive power. As a result, people live beneath the nightmare of a hurricane that could be unleashed at any moment causing unimaginable misery."[1]

The Encyclical "Pacem in Terris" testified to considerable progress in the attitude of the Catholic Church on issues of war and peace. As the French Marxist André Moine remarked: "Only yesterday the Church saw war as an opportunity to destroy socialism: today it sees it as the danger of the destruction of christianity."[2]

While welcoming the general attitude displayed in the Encyclical, there are a few things to be noted about the concept of peace it contains. Firstly, it extends the concept of peaceful coexistence to beliefs and classes. The Pope speaks of peace between creeds, nations and classes and, accordingly, Church ideologists accept peaceful coexistence as implying peace between the antagonistic classes in capitalist society and between bourgeois and socialist ideology as well as between nations.

The Marxist concept of peaceful coexistence is based on the thesis that disagreements between socialist and capitalist countries can be solved by peaceful means despite fierce class con-

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 128-29.

[2] A. Moine, *Après "Pacem in Terris". Chrétiens et communistes*, Paris, 1965, p. 95.

flict in the bourgeois countries: it is a form of ideological struggle and economic competition between the two systems, and does not involve renunciation of the class struggle or the national liberation struggle.

Pope John's course towards peaceful coexistence, which found its clearest expression in the Encyclical "Pacem in Terris" met with opposition on the part of the more reactionary elements in the Catholic Church, who continue to cling to the policy of cold war and preparation of aggression. Lo Svizzero, in his book, *The Church after John XXIII*, published in Italy in 1963, accuses the Pope of controlling a new opium for the people—the idea of peace on earth—thereby helping destroy the Catholic Church and playing into the hands of the Communists.

Those opposed to the Pope's policy did their best to see to it that the Encyclical got as little attention as possible. A letter in *The Guardian* claimed that "most Catholics in England are still ignorant of its content", which tended to suggest that the Catholic hierarchy in Britain was loth to follow the course proposed by the Pope over matters of war and peace.[1]

The French Jesuit journal *Etudes* wrote that the text of the Encyclical had not been brought to the attention of the Holy Chancellery prior to publication since its leaders made no secret of their opposition to the neutral stand of Pope John XXIII.[2]

There were even attempts to distort the text of the Encyclical. A speaker at the Congress of the Communist Party of Germany in 1963 noted that "the Catholic information agency crudely distorted two important passages of the Encyclical. It saw to it that the stress fell on the theological problems, trying to gloss over the question of peaceful coexistence".[3] A serious conflict developed within the Catholic Church over the question of the Church's stand on war and peace.

The question came up for discussion at the III and IV sessions of the Second Vatican Council, in 1964 and 1965 respectively. At the very first session the Pope had declared that it was necessary to promote the creation of a new atmosphere in international affairs and eliminate all conflicts, especially war,

---

[1] *The Guardian*, April 14, 1964.

[2] *Etudes*, Paris, June 1963, p. 407.

[3] *Parteitag der Kommunistischen Partei Deutschlands*, Berlin, 1963, S. 261.

that "scourge of the nations". The Pope called for decisive steps towards ensuring lasting peace. An appeal to the peoples of the world was adopted at this first session in which the participants pledged their support for Pope John XXIII's call for peace, for co-operation, mutual understanding and rapprochement between the nations.

At the III and IV sessions a fierce struggle developed over the question of the attitude the Catholic Church should adopt towards nuclear weapons. Opinions were sharply divided over this issue. Many of the Bishops, particularly those from France, Holland and Belgium, were for condemning war as a means of implementing national policy, and spoke in favour of banning nuclear weapons.

Scheme XIII (draft decree), which came up for discussion at the III Session of the Council, held in the autumn of 1964, condemned nuclear war and criticised policies based on the balance of forces and deterrence. It contained a demand for the abolition of nuclear weapons, and urged support for all international organisations concerned with preventing war and halting the arms race. It also mentioned the need for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes.

The new draft version of this Scheme XIII submitted for discussion at the IV Session contained certain inconsistencies. While condemning total war as being war against God and man, declaring the balance of fear to be a monstrous idea, and urging the destruction of modern weapons, it at the same time justified the possession of nuclear weapons where the sole aim was to deter aggression, and countenanced their use, in the spirit of traditional Catholic doctrine, to counter aggression.

The section of the scheme that concerns the question of war and peace did however reflect the sentiments of those elements in the Catholic Church that take a realistic view of the existing relationship of forces and the danger of nuclear war for all mankind, and thus for the Church.

There were also those who spoke in favour of what they regarded to be "just" wars, expressed their disagreement with Scheme XIII, and argued that a nuclear war waged by the Western Powers would be just since its aim would be the defence of Christianity.

Reactionary Catholic theoreticians are less concerned with preventing another world war than with deciding in what circumstances it would be justified from the point of view of

Catholic morality. The Jesuit de Soras declares that "theologists can justify a state that attacks first if in so doing it is pursuing the aim of asserting its undisputed rights after having tried all peaceful means. They require that the reason for resorting to force was serious enough to justify the evil caused by military operations."[1]

At the Vatican Council, Bishop Hannan of the United States insisted that the Church should not object to the limited use of nuclear weapons: "At present there exist nuclear weapons of fairly limited destructive power.... There are weapons with a radius of action of 1.3 to 2.5 miles and a destructive power of 40 tons of TNT. These weapons are designed to destroy set military objectives while avoiding the devastation caused by large-scale nuclear explosions."[2]

Bishop Hannan and Archbishop Beck of Liverpool demanded the suppression of the paragraphs mentioning the need to renounce nuclear weapons. They also disagreed with the statement condemning nuclear, bacteriological and chemical weapons, contained in Scheme XIII. Both condemned "extreme pacifism", by which they intended all open opposition to nuclear weapons. Some of those who spoke camouflaged justification of war against the socialist countries with appeals for peace. Thus, Cardinal Ottaviani, a die-hard Conservative who had frequently spoken in defence of imperialist aggression, deemed it necessary to appear as a supporter of peace. But his "peace-loving" message delivered to the Council really amounted to an appeal for war against totalitarian states, by which he meant the socialist countries. At the same time he condemned just national liberation wars as guerilla wars, thereby distorting their nature and aim.

The final text of the fifth section of "The Church in the Modern World" passed by the Vatican Council condemned massacre (stressing that it is the massacre of ethnic minorities that is intended) by any means whatsoever. Paragraph 80, dealing with total war, condemns indiscriminate devastation of cities and whole areas since this comes outside the pale of legitimate defence.

Section Five bears the stamp of a compromise with the United States Catholic hierarchy. At the Council, and in particular at the Fourth Session, the US hierarchy spearheaded a

---

[1] A. de Soras, *Morale Internazionale*, Catania, 1963, p. 90.
[2] *La Documentation catholique*, 1964, No. 1438, col. 1609.

drive to prevent it being passed, distributing appeals to participants to vote against it.

The XIII Scheme represents something of a step backwards from the "Pacem in Terris" Encyclical, in view of the inclusion of the point on the right to use nuclear weapons for defence. Nevertheless, the passing of "The Church in the Modern World" was of great importance as giving an important impulse to the peace movement.

Many of those who spoke at the Council, unlike Hannan and Beck, showed a realistic view of the world situation, and an understanding of and sympathy with the longing of the faithful to prevent nuclear war. Thus, Cardinal Alfrink (Holland) said: "Not only the 'dirty bomb', but also what is called the 'clean bomb' should clearly be condemned. General discussion of such serious problems could lead to misconceptions among certain sections of the public. It is necessary to express ourselves with equal clarity on just and unjust war. Can a war with atomic weapons be called 'just'?"[1]

The Patriarch of Antioch, Maximus IV, said: "The threat of destruction hangs over the whole of mankind. It is a question of atomic weapons.... People often speak of just war, but what motives could morally justify devastation tantamount to a universal cataclysm! Is it permissible to destroy civilisation and whole peoples on the pretext of defending them?"[2] The Patriarch called upon the Council to condemn the use of nuclear, bacteriological and chemical weapons.

It should be noted that these praiseworthy declarations are unfortunately not always accompanied by real support for the forces of peace. The Vatican has never condemned the aggressive NATO bloc, or the dangerous policy of the West German revanchists and their trans-Atlantic patrons, and has frequently put the imperialists and the victims of their aggression in the same category. Thus, in the papal Encyclical "Mense Maio" ("In the Month of May"), issued on May 1, 1965, Paul VI said: "There is at present a terrible aggravation of conflicts between nations in some parts of the world and the repetition of a dangerous phenomenon—the use of armed force instead of talks for the resolution of disputes. This means that the population of whole countries is having to undergo terrible suffering, caused by all kinds of disturbances, guerilla warfare and military

---

[1] *La Documentation Catholique*, 1964, No. 1438, col. 1659-1660.
[2] *L'Osservatore Romano*, November 10, 1964, p. 3.

operations, which are spreading and worsening all the time and could spark off a fearful new conflict at any moment".[1] In the same breath Pope Paul condemns the US aggressors in Vietnam and the just war of national liberation waged by the Vietnamese people against the aggressors. The Encyclical is typical of the Vatican's rather inconsistent, muddled approach to problems of war and peace.

In the Encyclical "Christi Matri" of October 19, 1966, Pope Paul made a new appeal for peace, calling for an end to the arms race and reminding people of the dangers of nuclear war. However, as in the "Mense Maio" Encyclical, he does not condemn American aggression in Vietnam, and draws no distinction between the aggressors and the victims of aggression. The neutral stand taken in the letter detracts from its role as an instrument of peace and in arousing public opinion against the aggressors.

If the Vatican stand can be described as basically peace-loving, the same can not be said of the Catholic hierarchy in several countries, and especially the USA and the FRG. Sticking to the attitude they adopted at the Vatican Council, American Catholic leaders are doing their best to sabotage the Council's decisions, particularly the document "The Church in the Modern World". This is shown by their attitude to the American war in Vietnam. In his address to the Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution held in Boston, August 1966, the Archbishop of Boston, Cardinal Cushing made the rather extraordinary remark that the war in Vietnam is the only means of preserving peace.[2] "Nobody likes war," he writes, "but there are moments in history when force must be used against evil people. The refusal of good people to use force would merely lead to the triumph of evil."[3]

Those members of the Church who support American aggression are meeting with growing opposition from the faithful and even other members of the clergy who are against the war in Vietnam. The papal Encyclical of March 1967, "Populorum Progresso" was a most significant declaration of the Catholic Church for peace and international security. It is a clear expression of the new trends to be observed in the Christian approach to problems of peace and social progress.

---

[1] *L'Osservatore Romano*, May 1, 1965.
[2] *The Pilot*, August 27, 1966.
[3] *Informations catholiques internationales*, September 15, 1966, No. 272.

The line adopted at the Second Vatican Council, which despite the reservations contained in the documents was nevertheless a course of peace, is ignored by the Catholic hierarchy in the USA, West Germany and several other imperialist countries. American Church leaders support US aggression in Vietnam. At an episcopal conference held in November 1966, a declaration on the war in Vietnam was passed by 189 votes to 6 in which the bishops appealed to the American people to trust their government, and claimed that in the light of facts brought to their knowledge the war in Vietnam was justified.[1]

Early in 1967, the Catholic clergy were polled on their attitude to the policy of the Johnson administration. Of the 3,078 priests polled, 2,706 said that the United States should take a hard line and make sure it won the war in Vietnam, and 2,740 were of the opinion that the USA should rely mainly on military power rather than agreements with the Soviet Union.

In December 1965, and again in December 1966, Cardinal Spellman visited South Vietnam as the chief Catholic chaplain of the US Army to spend Christmas with the troops. During his second visit he gave eleven sermons. He assured them that the American army was an army of peace, that they were fighting for peace, and defending not only America but civilisation. He also said that there was no other possible solution but an American victory.[2] In May 1967, Cardinal Spellman exhorted people to support "our boys in Vietnam who are fighting for liberty and against atheistic communism".[3]

The continuing upswing of the peace movement will almost certainly lead to the increasing isolation of the section of the Catholic clergy who are using religion to justify the aggressive plans and actions of the imperialists.

---

[1] *Herder-Korrespondenz (orbis-catholicus)*, 21. Jahrgang, 5. Heft, Mai 1967.

[2] *Carrefour*, Paris, December 28, 1966, p. 3.

[3] *The Pilot*, Boston, May 13, 1967, p. 18.

## Chapter XVI

# PACIFIST IDEOLOGY TODAY. THE AMERICAN QUAKER MOVEMENT

In recent years many Americans have been viewing the aggressive policy of their government with growing concern. This is shown by various public opinion polls,[1] the speeches of politicians and public figures, and the upswing in the activity of numerous anti-war movements and organisations. Naturally, much of this concern is occasioned by the war in Indochina. Often, however, Americans associate militarism not with any particular actions in the field of foreign affairs, but rather with the state of society as a whole—the powerful influence of the so-called "military-industrial complex", the growth of bureaucracy and corruption, increasing violation of the rights of the individual, etc. There is a strong tendency for the programmes of various organisations campaigning for peace, democratic rights and the immediate solution of the colour problem to draw closer together. It is significant that influential leaders of the anti-racist struggle like Martin Luther King and Malcolm X have frequently stressed the connection between the oppression of the Negroes and the aggressive war in Vietnam. Equally significant was the fact that the programme of the Students for a Democratic Society contained a clear demand for an end to the war in Vietnam and curbing of the power of the military.

Various Churches and religious organisations play an important role in the anti-war movement—viz., the resolution of

[1] See, for example, *Youth in Turmoil*, No. 4, 1969, p. 33.

the World Council of Churches, the position of the Black Moslems, the Methodist Church and Jewish religious leaders. One of the most active and influential of these religious movements is the American Friends Service Committee, the Quakers, who in 1947, along with the British Quakers were awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace.

The socio-political programme of the Quakers is extremely complex and many-sided and takes in many aspects of home and foreign policy. The Quakers are perhaps best known today for their anti-war demonstrations. The present organisation and activity of the American Quakers represents the most comprehensive expression of the ideology and practice of pacifism, which is extremely widespread in the West today.

The obscure metamorphosis that the old religious movement of Quakerism has undergone in recent times, involving the fusion of religious concepts with bourgeois liberalism and anti-militarism clothed in religious attire makes the task of analysis an extremely complicated one. An investigation must of necessity involve analysis of the social conditions which produced the Quaker outlook, the real problems it embodies and also its inner structure, method of presentation and argumentation.

* * *

Quaker ideology arose in the 17th century, in the age of the emergence of bourgeois production methods, and gave a religious coating to the interests of the bourgeoisie who were opposed to the rigid caste order of feudal society and the barriers it imposed, and against the established Church. Today, Quaker views represent an ideological survival in a society that has reached further stage in its development—the stage of monopoly capital.

For the highly religious writer, the process by which people come to adopt a particular social standpoint and their attitude to certain current political events is quite simply a matter of the concretisation of general religious dogmas or biblical propositions. For him there exist certain immutable divine principles which are applied in evaluating the phenomena of the changing world. He thus has a false picture of the true sources of his views. In point of fact, it is the other way round: social reality conditions a person's interpretation of "immutable" divine principles.

The Quaker social outlook centres round their own very special interpretation of the processes characteristic of modern

capitalist society. We need not trouble to go into these processes in detail here: suffice it to say that they are mainly derived from economic factors—the concentration of capital and the growth of the monopolies, imposing an ever tighter grip on society by virtue of both economic and non-economic bonds. The power of the monopolies extends to all social spheres—economic, political and ideological. As a result, people are coming to feel more and more like helpless puppets, manipulated by social forces that lie beyond their control.

In view of this there is a growing divorce between the traditional time-honoured slogans of bourgeois freedom and democracy, the ideals of free enterprise and bourgeois individualism on the one hand, and existing social relations on the other. All this is profoundly disturbing for the average American, and has attracted the attention of sociologists, psychologists, philosophers, politicians and theologists who have various interpretations and explanations to offer. Quaker ideology provides an interesting reflection of this process.

It is not hard to see why the traditional propositions of Quaker ideology should have assumed such actuality today. Quaker ideology took shape as a protest against the rigidity of feudal society, and against various non-economic forms of coercion. With the growth of the monopolies it is as if these features are raising their ugly heads again, and the problem of protecting the rights of the individual, individual freedom, understood as free private enterprise, has once more become extremely acute.

The Quakers are particularly concerned by one specific feature of present-day American society, and that is the increasing influence of military circles and the military industrialists, the arms race, aggressive foreign policy, the inculcation of militarist sentiments, etc. On the surface these phenomena appear in the form of reactionary political platforms, the actions of diplomats, politicians and military leaders, the activities of various state institutions and public organisations, the main propaganda trends and so on.

In order to understand the true cause and essence of such phenomena it is necessary to view them in terms of the basic laws of social development, and compare the qualitative features of those laws with the development of other social systems. It then becomes clear that wars, violence, militarism and aggressiveness are not to be regarded as "abnormalities" caused

by the deliberate actions of certain persons, for they are determined by objective laws of social development.

It is thus a question of the class character of the method employed in their analysis, of the analyst's general outlook. In this respect the Quaker position is quite clear. However much they may criticise the home and foreign policy of the United States, the Quakers remain what they have always been: convinced supporters of "the American way of life" and capitalist relations. This is only to be expected, since the Quaker teaching originally arose as a bourgeois brand of Christianity. Quaker religious doctrine reflected the humanistic trends of early bourgeois thought, central to which was the concept of man as a being endowed with fine moral qualities, which could be revealed with the aid of the "Holy Spirit". This concept was based on idealisation of the psychology of the small producer. Bourgeois freedom is their social ideal, which they see as being the main aim of the whole American people. "We believe that every man should be free to think for himself, to worship his God in his own way, to express his convictions, and to act, either alone or in association with others, in accordance with what he believes to be the highest good.... We believe that every people should have the same freedom to choose for itself the type of government under which it shall live, and to determine the policies of that government."[1]

In short the Quaker position is highly paradoxical: the Quakers are for the development of the capitalist economy but against the concentration of capital which destroys the independence of the small producer, they are for free trade but against the non-economic coercion of the monopolies. They are for capitalism and private enterprise, but only on the basis of "moral", "humane" principles.[2]

This contradictory attitude is reflected in Quaker ideological doctrine. The Quakers are opposed to the development of monopoly capitalism but support capitalism, as the "natural" form of human community. That is why the Quaker theoretician is

---

[1] *Steps to Peace. A Quaker View of US Foreign Policy. A Report Prepared for the American Friends Service Committee*, Philadelphia, 1961, p. 7.

[2] It need hardly be stressed that as supporters of the ideology of capitalist enterprise and bourgeois freedom, the Quakers are hostile to socialism. They frequently write of "totalitarianism", "fanaticism", "the loss of individual freedoms" and so on, as occurring under socialism. Sometimes they simply echo the current slogans of official propaganda.

unable to examine the objective causes determining the "extremes" he condemns. His attention is entirely limited to the sphere of behaviour, and his mind never penetrates beyond outward phenomena (although he claims to be explaining them). Thus, for him it is only features that are permanent or continually repeated and reflected in visible external phenomena that he regards as "laws", and not the real causes underlying these phenomena. A law is equated to some ideal model of realisation of a phenomenon, to the form deprived of real content. In the end a curious metamorphosis takes place.

The law, derived from permanent or recurrent phenomena as a generalisation of purely empirical observations, is substituted for the original concrete facts, which are then viewed as individual instances confirming the validity of the "general law".

Thus, the Quaker's thoughts inevitably go round in circles, abstract propositions being regarded as concrete empirical facts, and the general logic of his reasonings is the sum total of such circles of different radius. The Quaker conception is then projected onto a vast amount of factual material. However, its basic elements remain the same: the formulation of views, which in their author's opinion are the only way to ensure peace, the suggestion that existing social relations do not correspond to this formula, and the attempt to explain why—the reason being sought in the generalised expression of the very facts which awaited explanation.

* * *

In examining the views of the Quakers we shall be referring chiefly to *Speak Truth to Power*[1], since this work is extremely typical of Quaker sociological views. In their attempt to analyse present United States home and foreign policy, the authors begin by pointing out some of the most typical features that may later provide the key to understanding concrete phenomena. They regard the "rule of violence" as the main feature of modern life.

They hold that violence permeates the whole of society, that this is an "age of violence". "It is also an age in which individual personality is being crushed by the spread of totalitarian doctrines. The growth of centralized authority is producing a

[1] *Speak Truth to Power. A Quaker Search for an Alternative to Violence. A Study of International Conflict Prepared for the American Friends Service Committee.*

depersonalized society in which men are pressed into a common mould and made to conform to accepted standards of thought and behaviour. The noble concept of the supremacy of the individual ... is rapidly losing ground to various forms of totalitarianism. Centralized authority... is the dominant force in large segments of East and West alike."[1]

At the same time, this is "an age of revolution". Technological progress has raised mankind's material living standards to a level that was once undreamed of. Yet these opportunities are not taken advantage of. The industrialised nations are only concerned with satisfying their own needs, leaving millions hungry and destitute. This paradox of modern society "is more deeply rooted and more widely spread, for it grows out of the very mastery of the instruments of power that man so confidently sought. Poverty and wealth, hunger and food, insecurity and power, bondage and freedom, war and peace—these are the real paradoxes...."[2]

The contrasts in bourgeois society are so patent that it requires no more than empirical observation to establish them. But the insistence on a "paradox" in the logic of modern social study can serve various purposes.

It can serve as a point of departure, taken as defying explanation, as a testimony of our inability to see the inner connections between phenomena when limiting ourselves to observation of what is immediately visible on the surface of things. In this case, a scientific analysis will show the paradox to be merely apparent and will reveal the inner mechanism which produces it: the natural laws of private ownership automatically engender exploitation, violence and wars.

These is another way, characteristic of the religious outlook, whereby the "paradox" is "ontologised", regarded as a self-contained, irreducible feature of social life, testifying to the presence of two separate lines of development. In this case, two opposite poles are raised to the level of absolutes, excluding all possibility of a rational explanation. The Quaker conception is of this type, it bisects the world into the human and the divine. "One of the most profound problems that man must face," we are told, "arises from the conflict between his individual response to his world environment and the political response of the group of which he is part."[3] This kind of state-

[1] *Speak Truth to Power...*, p. 2.
[2] Ibid., p. 3.
[3] Ibid.

ment, which is typical of modern theology, could well be used as a basis for analysis of the "external" forces that exert pressure on man. But here the authors immediately plunge into another realm, treating the conflict between the individual and the forces to which he is enslaved not as a clash in life itself, but as an expression of the anti-thesis between the divine and the human in every individual. "As Americans, we are both individual children of God with deep commitments to the supremacy of conscience, and citizens of a nation that plays a major role in shaping and meeting the issues that surround us."[1] As we shall see, this "anti-thesis", in various forms, runs through the whole Quaker outlook.

The authors of this booklet are mainly concerned with military policy, the arms race, and attempts to use force in the rivalry between the two "super-powers"—the United States and the Soviet Union. They see this as the root of the contradictions inherent in the world today. The hopes of lasting peace which seemed so well-founded after the war were soon to prove vain, for "twenty years of pre-war hostility had produced in both Russia and the West mutual suspicions too profound to be broken down by an uneasy war-time alliance".[2] Thus, a policy of force, the arms race, and a situation of mutual suspicion and reciprocal threats reigns in the world today. Since the booklet is addressed above all to the American government, the authors are mainly concerned with examining US policy. Once again we find the expected duality in the Quaker views. While condemning the main direction and aims of American foreign policy, they at the same time insist that it is based on concern for the "national interests", and altruistic, humane principles. Viewing politics as the embodiment of certain particular ideas, they regard American policy as the realisation of the avowed American ideals of freedom, equality, democracy, and so on. They therefore treat the facts of aggressiveness, violence, collusion with reaction and so on, not as the logical, inevitable expression of the imperialist nature of this policy, but as rather distressing, unwarranted features.

It must be said that in appraising the practical foreign policy of the United States, the Quakers refuse to swallow "official versions" wholesale, and often go a fair way towards interpreting things in their true light. They note, for example, that the

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid., p. 4.

Marshall Plan after the war was advanced "almost simultaneously with the policy to contain the Soviet state and communism by force".[1] They have no illusions, either, about the creation of NATO and SEATO, the policy of rearming West Germany, the signing of a peace treaty with Japan and so on. They show how in many parts of the world American policy is based chiefly on military force, and often involves the suppression of freedom and the rights of other peoples.

It should also be noted in their favour that the Quakers are aware, in their own way, of the connection between power politics and the offensive on democratic rights.

The authors of the booklet show how the traditional bourgeois freedoms are being sacrificed to the requirements of a military posture leading to the gradual submergence of individual rights.

The Quakers are often fully aware of the connection between the influence of militarist propaganda and the conditions that obtain in society. Thus, the British Quaker P. Seed sets out to probe the psychological aspects of the arms race, and asks why it is that many Englishmen believe in the danger of aggression and the need to defend their country from enemies.[2] He sees two contributing factors: "The first is the extreme degree of diminished personal responsibility arising from the fact of living in a mass organised society, subject of such influences as advertising, political propaganda, and the very fact of being just one in a crowd.... The second new factor arises from the development of modern weapons."[3] He goes on to say how relations between people are becoming more and more superficial and mechanical, and that this is one reason why people feel defenceless and are susceptible to the influence of militarist propaganda.

Certainly Seed is describing real processes typical of bourgeois society today. But as soon as one attempts to make these typical features serve as an explanation for the phenomena described, they lose all validity. This is especially evident in the attempts of our Quaker authors to give a sociological explanation for "power politics". It should be remembered that this is a key moment in the Quaker social philosophy, since they regard the present commitment to violence as the cause of mili-

[1] Ibid., p. 5.

[2] P. Seed, *The Undefended. Psychological Aspects of the Problem of Disarmament and Possible Solutions*, London, p. 3.

[3] Ibid., p. 6.

tary conflicts. This begs the question of what it is that produces this form of relations between people, social groups and countries. "Why is it that hopeful proposals have so often remained only idle, intellectual exercises printed in pamphlets or embodied in Congressional resolutions. . .?[1] Or to put it, as they do, in more striking terms: why is it that people "believe more in the power of the hydrogen bomb than in the power of love?"

The Quakers return to this question and attempt to answer it again and again. Moreover, their answer is intended as an argument in favour of their faith, as their "positive" programme. Yet it cannot be said that their explanation really reveals the causes of violence: indeed, strictly speaking, it is not an explanation at all, but merely the vicious circle that characterises all religious sociological thought, so that behaviour is in the last analysis put down to . . . behaviour. The Quakers reject the idea that the causes of violence are to be sought in specific social tendencies. They insist that it is to be sought in the characteristics of the individual, irrespective of what society he lives in. "The real evils that have driven the world to the present impasse, and which we must struggle to overcome, spring from the false values by which man has lived in East and West alike. Man's curse lies in his worship of the work of his hands, in his glorification of material things, in his failure to set any limit on material needs. This idolatry leads him to lust for power, to disregard human personality, to ignore God, and to accept violence or any other means of achieving his ends. It is not an idolatry of which the communists alone are guilty. All men share it, and when it is examined, the global power struggle is given a new perspective."[2]

Overtones of the Quaker religious outlook are clearly evident in the above. Here we have a modern version of the Christian dogma of man's "sinfulness" as the root of all social evil. Further on this idea is no longer implied but clearly stated: "the real evils at the root of the tragic conflicts which threaten to destroy mankind are those that flow from man's idolatry: lust for power and the inability of power to set limits to itself; the violation of human personality and infringements on its freedom and dignity; the 'practical atheism' of a pervading materialism and secularism; the spreading cult and practice of violence and the poisonous doctrine that *our* ends justify all

---

[1] *Speak Truth to Power. . .*, p. 13.
[2] Ibid., p. 28.

means."[1] Thus, the authors' thoughts have described a complete circle, returning to the presence of violence in the world, but this time not as an empirical observation of the phenomenon itself but as the fundamental cause of such phenomena.

As we have seen, the Quakers proceed from the characteristic phenomena of monopoly capital: they talk of "centralised authority", "the machinery of coercion", the "depersonalisation" of society, obligatory subscription to ideological standards, the spread of conformism and so on and so forth. Yet according to their reasoning a particular policy or the behaviour of certain social groups are simply the sum of individual behaviour, while the factors determining the appearance of these groups and conditioning the ideas and tastes of their members are completely ignored. Thus, for the Quakers, a social group or class only forms a unit in so far as the individuals that comprise them can be observed to follow a common course of behaviour, and social tendencies are regarded simply as a combination of individual behaviour.

The Quaker concept of man is certainly humanistic and democratic. The Quakers firmly believe in man's ability (with the aid of the "Holy Spirit") to choose "the policy of eternity", to behave according to what they consider to be high moral principles and resist the wheel of sin that dominates society. But this optimism is based not on a realistic analysis of modern social tendencies but on their faith in the individual's capacity for self-perfection according to Christian principles. For this reason, their programme, though dictated by noble intentions, really amounts to no more than wishful thinking.

* * *

We have already seen how the Quakers regard relations between the United States and the Soviet Union as the main cause of tension in the world today. This is why they write so much of the "challenge of communism", of Soviet "totalitarianism", and devote a great deal of effort to interpreting the foreign policy of the USSR. At the same time they always try to place themselves "above" the two "conflicting giants", condemning the foreign policy of both. They maintain that it is immaterial which side was the first to display bad will: the important thing is that it has become a fact of present-day life, and a way must be found to put an end to it.

[1] *Speak Truth to Power...*, p. 31.

The Quaker chief concern is to refute the idea that "power politics" can serve as a means of resolving national problems and is justified as being in the interests of national security. They generally argue somewhat as follows: 1) the influence of the Soviet Union, and the appeal of its communist doctrines, have grown steadily since the end of World War II, while the position of the United States and its prestige throughout the world have been declining; 2) the aggressive policy of the United States tends to confirm the Marxist view of the aggressive nature of capitalism and increases hostility between the two "blocks"; 3) the traditional principles of US policy are being seriously undermined, as a result of increasing US interference in the internal affairs of other countries, support for dictators, and encouragement of the arms race and so on; 4) this policy is not in the interests of national security, but, on the contrary, is producing increasing fear and a growing sense of hopelessness among Americans; 5) as a result of all this, the nation's moral standards have been debased.[1]

What constructive programme do the Quakers offer in the place of the policy of force? Obviously, it is a programme designed to put an end to the rule of violence in the world, so that the way it is formulated depends on the explanation the Quakers give for the latter. As we have seen, the Quakers either equate the cause of violence with the fact of violence, or attribute it to idolatry practised by the whole of mankind. Their programme is thus limited to appeals to refrain from violence or for moral self-perfection according to Christian principles.

One occasionally comes across an oblique reference to the social causes of the policy of force in Quaker writings, but they have their own rather strange interpretation of "the social". Thus, with regard to the East-West conflict, they maintain that it can no longer be discussed "in simplified terms of good and evil".[2] One might expect this to be followed by an attempt to break away from the interpretation of the conflict in terms of idolatry and seek its social causes. But no, the author simply regards the matter in terms of different attitudes to Christian ideas, as if this were the sole factor determining different forms of social organisation. The conflict, he says, is between the "Judaeo-Christian philosophy of man's

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 6-9.
[2] Ibid., p. 32.

innate worth"[1] and totalitarianism. Here again we find the traditional Christian attitude of contrasting the impure "wordly" morality with the "true", divine morality.

Thus, the "constructive" programme of the Quakers, even in its most sociological form, is concerned with removing the causes of the individual's idolatry and returning to "true" Christian standards. The Quakers note that there is a wide gap between actual social development and their recommendations. In claiming their programme for the reformation of society, their "policy of eternity", to be a "realistic" one, the Quakers have to find a sphere of life in which it can be put into effect.

The Quakers view every individual as consisting of two essences: a divine essence which is the source of true moral virtue, and a human, sinful essence. Hence, the view of man's duality, the division into "inner", religious, moral man and "outward", inessential, social man. Social evil can thus only be abolished by means of the moral perfection of the individual, by the individual revealing his "genuine" divine essence, purged of "outward", social features, which merely spoil his true nature. In other words, a man is held to be virtuous in as far as he behaves as the "inner", religious man, full of humility and a sense of sonship to his Maker. This is merely a rephrasing of the traditional Christian idea that moral virtues are of "extra-social", divine origin.

This brings us to an essential feature of the Quaker standpoint. The Quakers do not address their appeals to any particular social groups, or even to the concrete socio-historical individual, but to the individuals in an abstract sense, possessed of an immutable nature, regarded above all as a religious being. His willingness to transform the world is taken for granted, as his personal duty to God. The Quakers explain the presence of social evil in the world today by the fact that modern human society blunts man's awareness of his obligations to God. "Human nature demands that people put their faith in someone and something. Yet few of us seem to have enough faith in God and the teachings of Christ to be willing to rely on them rather than armament. We believe the other alternative is faith in mankind as the creation of God, with His image in each one...."[2] Thus, going over to

[1] *Speak Truth to Power...*, p. 32.

[2] *Paths to Peace on Earth, Path 4* (Disarmament. Down to Police Level).

the "policy of eternity" involves "purging" man of "outward", "worldly" influences that eclipse the image of God in his soul and cause him to abandon true Christian humility. "We believe, therefore, that any proposal to resolve the conflict without violence must begin with a recognition of the humbling fact of man's common guilt and common nobility."[1]

It is suggested that only the practical introduction of certain "absolute" moral criteria—"eternal", divine moral standards—will enable people to rise above utilitarian considerations by which various groups of people may be guided in defending their interests.

In order to gain a clearer idea of this Quaker view, we ought to take a look at the special features of their concept of the relationship between God and man in which they differ essentially from most other Protestants. The Quakers stress the idea that God is constantly present in man, that He is immanent in human life. "The reality of God as a living Presence in the world and in men lies at the very center of the Quaker faith.... Every day is a day of creation. All history is sacred history.... They think of man's soul as a revealing place for God. Man is made in the divine image."[2] It is God's presence in man, in every individual, the presence of the "inner light" as the Quakers put it, that the Quakers regard as the foundation of human brotherhood. This conviction that there is something divine in every individual which gives him an inalienable dignity and nobility explains their insistence that man must not be submitted to exploitation in the interest of any aims whatsoever. This is what determines Quaker opposition to violence. "The Quaker doctrine of 'that of God in every man' is generally considered to be the basis for the pacifism of the Society of Friends".[3]

Moreover, the Quakers maintain that relations opposed to the policy of violence can only be achieved on the basis of Christian love.

Let us take a look at the line of thought that leads the Quaker theoretician to the conclusion that only the principle of divine love can serve as an effective means of improving society.

---

[1] *Speak Truth to Power...*, pp. 33-34.

[2] R. M. Jones, *The Quaker's Faith*, Philadelphia, p. 3.

[3] Gunnar Sundberg, *Toward Pacifism. The Convincement and Commitment of a Young European*, December 1950, Pendle Hill, Wallingford, p. 20.

We have already observed how the Quakers regard the very fact of violence as an independent, self-contained feature of human relations, personal and social, ultimately deriving not from fluent, changing social relations but from human nature, the nature of the individual, taken as being constant and immutable. Thus, a sphere of spiritual values lying outside morality and considered the product of man's "sinful" nature is regarded as determining all spheres of actual social relations—economic, political and cultural. Man's "sinfulness" is most manifest in his commitment to violence, in the hostile relations that exist between people. Since evil is innate in human nature, it can only be overcome or eliminated by the triumph of the opposite moral values: the effort to overcome hatred with love, pride with humility, the cult by man of his own works with awareness of his own sinfulness, idolatry with a return to God, and so on. The most universal of these formulae embodying the evangelical morality is the principle of love.

Unfortunately, it is impossible in the limited space available here to make a detailed analysis of this principle, which is far more complex than is generally realised. When a theologist advances the principle of Christian love as a basis for the transformation of society, he intends love not as an emotional relationship continuing "worldly" feelings, but a special "divine" love serving as a model for social relations. This emerges quite clearly in Quaker thought, where love is regarded as the underlying principle not of real, socially determined relations, but of some invisible, mystical "human family", a "divine-human society".

As we have seen, the Quakers do not approach analysis of society in terms of theory or passive diagnosis of its ills; but see it above all as a form of activity. The pacifism of the Quakers "is not the result of ivorytower theorizing but stems from direct experience with the raw edge of strife".[1] Yet they regard their action programme not as the continuation of actual politics, as the reflection of certain social forces, but as lying outside the context of real events. They see their role to consist in making a special "religious" survey of society, revealing the underlying mystical principles that the "secular" mind cannot grasp, rather than in presenting and explaining actually existing social programmes and forms of political

[1] W. Comfort, *The Quaker Way of Life*, Philadelphia, 1968, p. 166.

activity. Thus, they are convinced that they have an apostolic mission to perform in modern society, that they are bearers of the message of Christian truth, which, as distinct from purely human truths, is eternal. "Our *truth* is an ancient one: that love endures and overcomes; that hatred destroys; that what is obtained by love is retained, but what is obtained by hatred proves a burden. This truth, fundamental to the position which rejects reliance on the method of war, is ultimately a religious perception, a belief that stands outside of history."[1]

Thus, the Quakers gauge the likelihood of the success of their views as depending on how far they can go in convincing people of the need to adopt a "new" policy. The main aim of their preaching work is thus to demonstrate that their views are "realistic" and practicable. As a result, their theories are patently didactic.

In attempting to show the practicability of their conception, Quaker writers employ all sorts of arguments, invoking science, sociology, their movement's past, human feelings, man's sense of moral duty, and so on—so many, in fact, that it is impossible to examine them all here. We therefore propose to take a look at a few of these arguments, those that we consider most typical.

The chief of these is the reference to a higher "divine" morality—the only one appropriate to the providential nature of creation. "God did not create men to hate, nor establish His law so that peace could emerge from fury."[2] This argument is strictly speaking invalid since it is derived from a completely false concept of the processes by which the social or political stand of different religious movements and Churches are formed. The Quakers claim their interpretation of the Bible to be the only valid one. In point of fact, of course, there is no such thing as an immutable, single Biblical truth. As Feuerbach noted, every age has its own Bible of its own making. It is not Biblical dogma that determines the social stand of a Church or religious movement, but on the contrary, its political views that determine its interpretation of the Bible.

Another common argument used by the Quakers to substantiate their claim that their programme is perfectly realistic and

[1] *Speak Truth to Power...*, p. 375. It should be noted that Quaker preaching of "eternal truth" has little in common with insistent Christian sermonising which is not at all typical of the Quakers.

[2] Ibid., p. 50.

practicable is that it is most compatible with "democracy", which they believe to be "the noblest philosophy of social organization".[1] Here is yet another fundamental bourgeois misconception. For what is democracy? For the Quakers it is the triumph of the liberal democratic principles underlying the system of private enterprise. Yet such a society no longer exists. Advancing according to the inner objective laws of social development, bourgeois society has lost those features that the Quakers regard as "democratic". Thus, in invoking an ideal, non-existent democracy, the Quakers are ignoring the processes actually taking place in life, thereby belying their claim to a "realistic" programme.

The Quakers often regard as the chief merit of their position the fact that it takes into account the mortal danger of an aggressive policy in the nuclear age. This doubtless reflects the growing conviction in America that the path of war is suicidal, which even has a certain influence on military circles, restraining them to some extent from committing acts of overt aggression. Here the Quakers are opposed by the arguments of the militarists and the powerful propaganda machine for "brainwashing" the public. These arguments, producing a whole system of social myths, stereotype views, "patriotic" slogans, etc., have not arisen out of the blue: they reflect the interests of certain social groups and classes, and extremely influential ones at that. A "realistic" approach would necessarily involve perception and analysis of the social class factors underlying and determining militarist ideology, examination of the connection between such ideology and real interests, the forms in which capital operates, etc. Only then would anti-war arguments be directed to real social forces and not some abstract "common sense" and serve to expose not "eternal" human failings but the concrete historical forms of human relations and those people who go out of their way to exploit these failings. But, as we have already seen, the Quakers ignore concrete historical analysis, and can therefore do no more than hope and trust that sooner or later people will follow them, and that "human nature, illumined and ennobled by divine power, can bear effective witness in the direction of world community".[2] Thus, the "constructive" programme of the Quakers acquires clear utopian features.

---

[1] *Speak Truth to Power...*, p. 50.
[2] Ibid., p. 52.

It cannot be repeated too often that the Quaker conception does not stand up to strictly scientific, sociological criticism. However, our analysis will remain superficial unless we attempt to answer one question of fundamental importance: namely, how did this conception arise, what are its social roots? This is extremely important because Quaker ideology is not the fruit of philosophical speculation and arid theorising, but embodies certain experience acquired spontaneously and independently of the activities of individual ideologists. Therefore, if we wish to judge this conception "from the inside", according to its "innate" "inherent" organic criteria rather than "from the outside", according to "external" criteria, we have no alternative but to examine this experience.

The Quakers regard the elimination of violence as a gradual process of transposing ordinary, everyday relations to the various other spheres of social, international, political, class and various other relations.

There is hardly any need to demonstrate the illusory nature of such an attitude. Of course, the Quakers are right in drawing a distinction between ordinary, everyday relations and political, class relations—they are indeed very different things—but in doing so they demonstrate a very naive concept of the relationship and interaction of the two. Society cannot be regarded as an "enlarged family", for it is highly heterogeneous, with objective laws and tendencies, various institutions, spontaneous social forces, and so on at work which are quite independent of the will or moral convictions of individuals. This thesis of the materialist concept of history is sufficiently well-known to require no further elaboration here. Indeed, the view that the social sphere is basically independent of individual morality is widely current in various trends of Western sociology. Suffice it to mention Niebuhr's famous dilemma of "the moral individual and the amoral society", numerous works by American philosophers and sociologists that analyse the process of alienation and bureaucratisation in progress in contemporary society (Riesman, Fromm, Mills, etc.), the theories of the existentialists, and so on.

We are now in a position to take a look at the formation of the Quaker social outlook.

The Quaker theoretician does not analyse the objective fabric of society, the extent to which certain relations and ties are essential, the alternation of form and content, phenomenon and essence and so on. He rather "lives" the

events he is describing, fixing them in the sequence and degree of substantiality that he perceives through direct experience. It is on such perception that his social views are based, although he imparts to them an integrated conceptual form, giving them the semblance of a theory based on principles of scientific research. In the absence of sufficient facts or real scientific arguments (as it seems to him, at least), he makes up for the lack by reinforcing his general view with faith, passionate conviction, moral principles, etc. Thus his conception ultimately depends not on logic or strictly scientific analysis, but on his belief in the truth and "desirability" of his ideas. "Pacifism, I presume, must remain emotional to some extent. It cannot be a matter of the intellect alone. Feeling, intuition, faith, all play their role. The unconditional acceptance of human brotherhood is an important element."[1]

So much for the theoretical side of the Quaker programme.

* * *

Let us now turn to the practical side of the Quaker "constructive" programme, which is determined by their own special interpretation of the laws of social development.

Many religious campaigners for social reform do not go beyond the level of simple religious sermonising. The Quaker programme forces attention as a social phenomenon by virtue of the fact that it is definitely intended as a plan for practical action. The Quakers accept only one way of putting this plan into practice, and that is non-violent action directed towards achieving universal brotherhood. "It seeks to knit the break in the sense of community whose fracture is both a cause and a result of human conflict.... It offers a way of meeting evil without relying on the ability to cause pain to the human being through whom evil is expressed. It seeks to change the attitude of the opponent rather than to force his submission through violence. It is, in short, the practical effort to overcome evil with Good."[2] Analysis of this approach lies far beyond the scope of our present examination of Quaker activities, since the tactic of "non-violent protest" is extremely widespread in US democratic movements at the present time.

To begin with, let us see how the Quakers define the term

---

[1] Gunnar Sundberg, *Toward Pacifism*, Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Penn., 1950, pp. 16-17.

[2] *Speak Truth to Power...*, p. 35.

"non-violence". "We use this term 'non-violent action' because, though the behaviour of the persons described is determined enough, and even in its own way forceful, it is without physical violence."[1] It must be said that this is a rather over-simplified definition, since in point of fact the term non-violence covers a multitude of different forms of action and possible social consequences.

First of all, let us take those forms of action that are intended to influence public opinion in a certain direction. Their effectiveness is to be measured simply according to the influence they have on the people responsible for the object of the protest. Various legal methods are resorted to in such cases, such as inquiries into the activities of government bodies, petitions, the publication of material in newspapers and magazines, the dissemination of leaflets or pamphlets, peaceful demonstrations and the like. In other words, the idea is to propagate certain ideas, without exerting any direct practical influence on the object of protest. This is the most typical form of action taken by various liberal-democratic organisations, including the Quakers, and does not generally result in violence or police interference.

What exactly do those engaged in such forms of non-violent protest hope to achieve? They insist that the main thing is to make those who employ force realise that their victims are their fellow human beings. The aim is thus to achieve a rapprochement between oppressors and their victims, between those who wield power and those who suffer from the way they exercise it, by "identifying" themselves with their victims. The Quakers claim that this is the only way to overcome the conflicts between them.

This end is best served by actions that demonstrate the good will, courage and sincerity of those who perform them, in many cases by actions that involve obvious suffering. The main thing here is not suffering in itself, but the suffering of human beings endowed with noble moral qualities. "Whether the suffering is perceived as human or non-human suffering depends upon these actions."[2] In short, such methods can only be successful where the suffering is undergone voluntarily.

It is not at all surprising that we should hear this from

[1] G. Lakey, *Non Violent Action. How It Works*, Lebanon, Pennsylvania, 1963, p. 3.

[2] Ibid., p. 14.

the Quakers, since the idea of voluntary suffering is an important feature of the Christian ethic. The insistence on the suffering being voluntarily undergone is understandable, since suffering is only indicative of a person's moral qualities, provided it is voluntarily assumed as a conscious choice, i.e., suffering is human if a person could avoid it but declines to for moral motives.

But this brings us to an important consequence of this view of the way non-violence works. If we accept that this method is effective in so much as the sufferings of the protestors are voluntary, then we are surely bound to admit that the use of this method against violence only has any sense insofar as the violence too is voluntary, i.e., can be renounced. This method is therefore completely ineffective against violence that has deep-rooted social causes.

We have already noted that the Quaker definition of non-violence is rather vague. "Non-violent" action can be merely a background to social phenomena, an accompanying factor, it can also be a factor disrupting the normal course of these phenomena. Thus, a "silent demonstration" can stand outside the Pentagon till the cows come home, without having the slightest influence on the activities going on inside, without arousing any desire for "identification" among the military officials. Yet strike action by workers, which also falls into the "non-violent" category is quite a different matter. One can hardly attribute concessions made by the employers to their having "identified themselves" with the workers. Thus, in some circumstances this method works according to the principle of force. In the above case, for instance, the employers are forced to take notice of the consequences of the activities of those using it.

Our considered opinion, therefore, is that while "non-violence" remains at the root of such activity, there is a growing tendency for the method of "convincing" one's opponent to be replaced by the method of force. This tendency is certainly typical of many social movements in the United States, and has been particularly noticeable in the movement against racial segregation and discrimination, where the old tactics were supplemented by the "non-violent direct action", first successfully adopted by Martin Luther King. "Non-violent direct action," he wrote, "seeks to create such a crisis and establish such creative tension that a community that has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue.

It seeks so to dramatise the issue that it can no longer be ignored."[1]

"Non-violent direct action" involves interrupting the normal working routine of factory, shop, bus station, etc., and thus represents the use of force, albeit in a special way. It is "non-violent" insofar as the participants, while refusing to comply with the orders of the powers-that-be, do not respond with violence to police measures. It is interesting to note the development of this tactic in organisations adhering to the Christian idea of non-violence and appealing to people's hearts and conscience. The fact that they found it necessary to resort to a certain degree of force shows that their former methods (petitions, inquiries, appeals, etc.) had proved ineffective.

The peace movement has deep roots in the United States and is constantly developing, altering its methods of struggle and ideology. By and large, without going into the various details and nuances, we can note the same general trend towards active struggle involving the use of force, though developing far more slowly, as in the civil rights struggle. The development of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, which has offshoots in various countries, provides an interesting example of this. It began as a movement fully committed to non-violent action, whose aim was to influence public opinion by all kinds of methods strictly within the bounds of the law. However, many of its adherents gradually became more and more convinced of the fruitlessness of such action, and the more energetic ones seized the idea of "direct action", i.e., active interference in the activities of those conducting a militarist policy. Whereas before it was simply a matter of holding peaceful demonstrations calling for the dismantling of rocket bases, demonstrators now marched to the base in question, set up pickets on the approach roads and tried to obstruct its normal activities. Such actions inevitably led to police intervention, beatings, arrests and court charges.

All this applies to the activities not of isolated individuals but of special organisations created for the purpose of employing the new tactic. One such organisation, for example, is the Committee for Nonviolent Action—a small but extremely active organisation founded in 1957. One of their leaflets contains the following: "There is a game.... Two

[1] M. L. King, *Letter from Birmingham City Jail*, 1963, p. 5.

people take revolvers and put one cartridge in each. The chambers of the revolvers are then spun and the people put the guns to their heads and pull the triggers simultaneously. (If neither gun fires, the game is repeated). Eventually, someone dies. The great nations of the world are playing... with H-bombs, missiles and jet bombers. Unless we stop this ghastly game, every one will die."[1] The Committee stresses the need for resolute action, and its supporters have given numerous examples of such action, including attempts to penetrate nuclear test zones in Nevada and the Sahara and various nuclear submarine bases, taking two small boats into H-bomb test waters, and so on. All these actions resulted in court charges and received wide publicity.

It is a well-known fact that more and more Americans have recently been resorting to active protest against their country's aggressive policy. There is a strong movement afoot among American youth, and particularly the students, demanding the withdrawal of American forces from Indochina. This action has not been limited to peaceful demonstrations. There have been numerous instances of large-scale brawls with the police on University campuses throughout the country. Then there were the mass demonstrations in Washington in the autumn of 1969, at which definite political demands were put forward.

What is the attitude of the Quakers to these tendencies? By and large, they reject methods involving the use of force. "It is absurd to think that the government is going to be *coerced* by the peace movement into unilateral disarmament or anything else. In the meantime, 300,000 or three *million* pacifists sitting down will not coerce the government because they are irrelevant to the defence structure of the nation."[2] They opt for the method of setting a good example. They "cannot make people stop fighting. But they can show that there are a few people who are still capable of showing good will."[3] Another aspect of Quaker non-conformism is that they are opposed to organised "non-violent resistance". According to Quaker tradition, participation in any collective action, such as the "peace watch" is a matter of individual choice, but can on no account be decided by any Quaker body

[1] Quoted from the leaflet, *The American European Peace March*, 87 Chancery Lane, London, England.

[2] G. Lakey, *Non Violent Action...*, p. 18.

[3] W. Comfort, *The Quaker Way of Life*, Philadelphia, 1968, p. 160.

officially, since they hold that this would represent an infringement of individual freedom. At the same time they try very hard to ensure that the supporters of various anti-war campaigns do not resort to illegal actions.

The Quakers do a considerable service in influencing public opinion against the war in Indochina. However, the mass protest movement against the war, for its political radicalism, methods of action and clear political awareness, adds more and more new dimensions to the struggle so that it is gradually coming to correspond less and less to the narrow, traditional forms of Quaker protest. Thus, many American draftees are refusing to respond to call-up, and there are numerous cases of draft-cards being demonstratively burned in public. There was a time when the Quakers' refusal to do military service brought them into conflict with the government, so that one might well expect them to approve of this form of protest. In fact, however, they adopt an extremely cautious attitude, maintaining that they do not view this as a suitable method; firstly, because it is illegal, and secondly, because it is directed against the war in Indochina and not against war in general, while the Quakers are protesting against war as a method of resolving disputes as a matter of principle rather than against American policy in Vietnam in particular. At the same time, faithful to their traditional philanthropical principles, the Quakers are trying to help the families of men imprisoned for avoiding the draft.

What can be said in conclusion, by way of summing up the ideology and activities of the Quakers?

Clearly, since the Quaker conception is unscientific, disseminates false ideas about the laws of social development and the ways of transforming society, and fails to reveal the real social contradictions, our final verdict on the Quaker ideology cannot be favourable. But it would be wrong to leave it at that.

The activities of the Quakers are not simply derivative from their social outlook, which is a reflection of the real contradictions inherent in American society. One must not confuse the social role of an ideology and the social role of the movement that produced it. The fact that an ideology is unscientific, does not prevent the corresponding movement from being democratic and progressive. Thus, one cannot judge Quaker ideology purely on the basis of the outlook it involves, but only in terms of the trends of the movement in the context of present-day

American socio-political life. It would be naive to expect the ideology of the peace movement to be a hundred per cent scientific in the context of intense bourgeois propaganda. This can only emerge after a long process of struggle and search involving numerous disappointments, as the result of experience acquired in political action. Indeed, a complex, painful process of evolving a scientific, realistic social philosophy and effective methods of struggle against militarism is actually in progress at the present time. And the activity and ideology of the Quakers is an important part of this process.

The Quakers render an important service in convincingly demonstrating the way the existing relations and institutions of American society are in sharp contradiction to the traditional democratic freedoms, and the fact that America's home and foreign policy are neither of them in the national interests. Quaker attempts to present the horrors of nuclear war and expose the false, criminal nature of such theories as "retaliation" and "limited war" have had a great impact. The fact that these ideas are cloaked in the traditional Christian guise has actually helped to promote their influence in a country where Christianity preserves great authority.

There is another important aspect of Quaker activities that deserves mention. The Quaker acts on behalf not of particular political doctrines but of elementary, universal moral principles, such as mutual respect, love, trust, honesty, the right to hold one's own opinions, strong family ties and so on. The fact that these demands remain unfulfilled, despite all the action taken on their behalf, causes people to think about these problems and make an effort to discover their real causes.

## Chapter XVII

# WESTERN SCIENTISTS AND INTELLECTUALS AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE

Today, the problem of war and peace is more closely connected with the development of science and technology than ever before. As a result, leading scientists throughout the world find themselves unable to ignore the problems of war and peace which have forced their way into the "sacred precinct" of science and knowledge.

In the post-war period progressive scientists and sociologists have been increasingly active in defending ideas for eliminating war and elaborating programmes for universal peace. This has been accompanied by growing criticism of the official ideology and policies of the imperialist countries for total war against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and "local wars" against the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America struggling for their national independence and freedom.

## General Features of the Anti-War Views of Western Scientists and Scholars

The growing opposition to war on the part of Western scientists and scholars is determined by a number of important objective factors of the socio-political realities of the world

today. Their views are an expression of three basic factors: firstly, growing international opposition to the forces of militarism and war that is manifest in the relations between the socialist and capitalist systems, in the international labour movement and the national liberation movement; secondly, the inherent contradictions in the socio-political and spiritual life of the capitalist countries, the mounting struggle of all the forces of peace against the extreme Right-wing forces of reaction, fascism and war, and thirdly, the acceptance by the more far-sighted and intelligent Western thinkers of the progressive anti-war traditions of humanism, and the universal democratic ideals of peace and social progress.

These traditions are not passively inherited and accepted but are being consistently developed by progressive, democratic scientists, in both the socio-political and ethico-ideological spheres. The historical events of the twentieth century are gradually producing a fuller awareness of the special importance of the present age in the history of mankind, realisation of the tremendous responsibility leading scientists bear for what happens in the world and hence of the need for selfless struggle to prevent a thermonuclear holocaust.

It is of fundamental importance for the anti-war activities of the scientists that they have a correct understanding of the true causes of war and the militarisation of science and technology in the West and are fully aware of the chief sources of violence in the present age. The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in 1969 addressed an "Appeal in Defence of Peace" to people of every station in society all over the world to call their attention to these causes. "Wars, acts of aggression and violence, encroachments on the freedom of nations—all have their roots in the policies of imperialism.... Imperialism is responsible for channelling the greatest achievements of science and technology, which throw open new vistas to humanity, for purposes of destruction, while at the same time hundreds of millions of people suffer from hunger and poverty".[1] These ideas are meeting growing response from leading scientists throughout the world.

The history of the present century, and especially the tragic lessons of the two world wars and the whole series of local

---

[1] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*, Prague, 1969, pp. 47-48.

wars in the post-war period caused by imperialist aggression against peoples trying to win their freedom, has forced many scientists to abandon the "ivory tower" of "pure science". The socio-political shortsightedness of adherents to the idea of "pure" science is harmful not only as encouraging "neutrality" and "non-interference" in politics, but as dangerous fellow-travelling with the forces of militarism and war. Practice has shown that it is impossible to remain aloof from the conflicts of our age. The forces of war and reaction not only exploit scientists: in the long run they repress those scientists who refuse to go along with them."

Max Born writes in this connection that the destruction of the historically shaped scientific centres by the nazis was the heavy political lesson learnt by the German scientists who wanted to keep away from politics and tried to defend academic freedom alone.[1] This lesson brought such famous German scientists as M. Born, O. Hahn and C. Weizsäcker, and many others over to opposition to nazism and militarism. Their own bitter experience served to convince some of the leading Western scientists of the impossibility of scientists remaining "uncommitted", since in the twentieth century science and technology have become a direct and powerful instrument of politics.

The great scientist Albert Einstein abandoned his neutral, pacifist position to become an active opponent of militarism at the time when militant fascism, including German nazism, rose its ugly head. Unlike Gandhi, he believes "in passive resistance only up to a certain point". He believes that "one should resort to violence whenever militant fascism arises. . . ."[2] Referring to the qualitative change that has occurred in the place and role of science, and especially physics, in society over the last few decades, Born says that modern physics is no longer the "quiet, pure science of old". Several Western countries are making use of it as a "decisive factor in the power politics of nations". Therefore, no scientist "can avoid the question of conscience how far he wants to collaborate in the development of forces which threaten the very existence of the civilised world".[3]

The life and work of Einstein and several other leading

---

[1] See Max Born, *Physics in My Generation*, London, 1956.
[2] Albert Einstein, *Philosopher-Scientist*, Evanston, 1949, p. 654.
[3] M. Born, *Physics in My Generation*, London, 1956, p. 223.

Western scientists, and the court charges brought against the nuclear physicist R. Oppenheimer and other anti-militarist scientists in the USA are convincing proof that science cannot remain "neutral" in the age of contest between the forces of reaction and progress; and that non-involvement in socio-political life is futile and even harmful. In his lecture "War and the Nations", Robert Oppenheimer points out the tremendous responsibility scientists have for the advice they give their governments, for what they say in public, and, especially, for finding the right direction in good time. He rightly insists that it is impossible for scientists to remain aloof from conscious social activity. "The question of what our purpose is on earth, the question of how we may make a government that would represent these purposes, the question of what our own responsibility is, the question of what business it is of ours to think about these things are not to be solved in any laboratory or settled by any equation or any mathematics."[1]

Karl Jaspers' courageous condemnation of militarism and the undemocratic features of the West German scene was followed by an open letter addressed to him by Walter Ulbricht, published in *Neues Deutschland.* Ulbricht wrote: "I hold a different view from you on many matters. But your book has convinced me that you are moved by the same concern that forces me and my political friends to use every opportunity to ensure peace in Germany and for Germany.... I am extremely moved by the fact that on the basis of our experience, and especially on the basis of our experience of two world wars and the events that led up to them, and also as a result of the transition of the Federal Republic of Germany to a formed society and ... we have reached similar conclusions on the major questions.... The time has come for all humanistically minded people to oppose this 'formed society'. We welcome the fact that you—along with many other scientists—raise a warning voice, pointing out the danger of such developments and openly defending the rights and interests of the masses and their longing for peace".[2] Thus, once again, in new historical conditions, the grave threat of war brings the spotlight back to the direct connection between the military danger of war and its social origins—the socio-economic and political system of capitalism.

[1] J. Robert Oppenheimer, *The Flying to Peace. Three Crises for Physicists*, London-New York-Toronto, 1964, pp. 62-63.

[2] *Neues Deutschland*, June 10, 1966, p. 3.

Jaspers is not alone. Many other outstanding members of the West German intelligentsia are approaching the masses in an attempt to oppose the threat of war and the reactionary political forces from whom this threat derives. Three hundred and sixty two West German professors signed a protest against emergency laws addressed to the West German Trade Union. The famous physicists Max Born, Otto Hahn, Carl Weizsäcker are also active champions of peace.

An important feature of the anti-war activities of leading scientists today is their growing solidarity and unity. This is indeed an important general feature of the development of the peace movement in the post-war period. Ideological differences did not prevent a large group of scientists headed by Einstein, Joliot-Curie, Bertrand Russell, Pauling and Rotblat from uniting to issue a joint Manifesto—known as the Russell-Einstein Manifesto—which presented the problem in the starkest terms: "Shall we put an end to the human race; or shall mankind renounce war?"[1] All differences were submerged by this common inescapable problem.

The last few decades have seen a noteworthy evolution, which is still going on, among the more far-sighted Western scientists towards a greater sense of social and moral responsibility for what happens in the world. The logic of their life and work involves them in the struggle against the forces of war and reaction. M. Born draws the patently correct and progressive general conclusion that for all scientists the "problem of responsibility is as international as science herself".[2]

For all their differences, the leading Western scientists who actively support peace are in agreement on the basic issues: unconditional condemnation of wars of aggression as the gravest of crimes against humanity, opposition to militarism and nuclear war, sincere dedication to the humanistic ideal of ensuring that scientific achievements are used in the interests of peace. These fundamental socio-political principles have always served as a unifying factor for progressive Western intellectuals. Today, they provide a rallying point for people of such different views and calling as the physicists Einstein and Born, the philosophers and sociologists Russell and Mills, the writers Ernst Hemingway and Remarque, the religious and

---

[1] J. Rotblat, "*History of the Pugwash Conferences*", *Science and World Affairs*, London, 1962, p. 40.

[2] M. Born, op. cit., p. 224.

public figures Johnson and Endicott, and the winners of the Nobel Prize for peace, Linus Pauling and Albert Schweitzer.

For many years these men have revealed in their writings and social activities the conviction that with the appearance of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, the problem of peace and war has become the major problem of the second half of the twentieth century. They intend that all men of good will everywhere should fully realise this and mobilise all their efforts to prevent nuclear war and decide the vital problem of our age—war or peace?—once and for all in favour of the latter. Yet in defining the nature of war they show themselves unable to advance objective criteria that could serve as the basis for a scientific classification of wars.

A typical example of the kind of classification advanced by Western scientists and scholars is that of the American professor of philosophy and sociology L. Mumford. "War differs in scale, in intention, in deadliness, and in frequency with the type of society," he writes.[1] Yet neither in the several hundred pages of his book, nor in other works by him and his colleagues do we find a satisfactory explanation of how the "type of society" actually affects these features let alone as to how it determines the socio-political content of a given war, making it progressive or reactionary.

It is Marxism-Leninism that gives the only scientific classification of wars, defining them as just or unjust on the basis of objective criteria—the concrete historical essence of a war. Thus, Lenin stressed the need to "be clear as to what historical conditions have given rise to the war, what classes are waging it, and for what ends," adding that "unless we grasp this, all our talk about war will necessarily be utterly futile, engendering more heat than light."[2] If war is waged by a people fighting for its independence and freedom, against imperialism, fascism or neo-colonialism, such a war is no doubt just. If a war is waged against the masses, it is criminal and ultimately doomed to ignominious defeat.

In our age the opposition between two antagonistic social systems, socialism and capitalism, stands out more clearly than ever before, as do the qualitatively different attitudes of the two systems to war. This to some extent compensates for the lack of perception and social limitations of the methodology

---

[1] Lewis Mumford, *Technics and Civilisation*, New York, 1934, p. 108.
[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 399.

of Western philosophers and sociologists who are opposed to war. Given conscientiousness and the abundance of facts they are able to draw the right conclusions as regards the socialist interest in preventing war and capitalist adherence to war.

The American scholar F. L. Schuman, who has devoted over forty years to serious study of the USSR, presents the view, founded on very sound arguments, that war is essentially alien to the socialist system. He notes that Lenin, in the earliest days of the Soviet state, learned that "reliance upon military force to extend Communism was a 'mistake' ".[1] Schuman considers that the Soviet state has always remained faithful to this principle throughout its history.

Analysing the nine years of war the Soviet state was forced to wage (1918-21 and 1939-45), Schuman concludes that they "were not the consequence of Communist military attacks upon the Western Powers but of anti-Communist military attacks upon the USSR.... Soviet war of defence against unprovoked attack aimed at the annihilation of the Soviet State".[2]

The attitude to war of the bellicose forces of contemporary imperialism and anti-communism—the so-called "military-industrial complex" in the USA, the FRG and several other Western countries—is diametrically opposed to this attitude of the socialist system. It was the inherent contradictions of the capitalist system, the Great Depression and all it entailed (monetary upheavals, economic stagnation, the militarisation of science and the economy), the emergence of fascism in Germany, Spain, Italy and Japan that were the inevitable causes of the Second World War.[3] Erich Fromm, in his book *May Man Prevail?* presents a penetrating and convincing analysis of the fundamental reasons for the adherence to militarism and war of those forces in the USA and other Western countries that detest socialism. He notes their fear of peaceful competition with the Soviet Union. This pathological fear leads the United States and anti-socialist forces in the West to opt for armed struggle against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in preference to socio-economic competition. Contrary to the dogmas of Western ideologists and politicians who are hostile to socialism, Fromm qualifies their adherence to militarism and war as a sign of the weakness, not the strength

[1] F. Schuman, *International Politics*, New York-Toronto-London, 1958, p. 501.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid., p. 102.

of the capitalist West, as defeatism and loss of faith in the values proclaimed by the West.[1]

Whatever their other differences, the most consistent and far-sighted Western scientists and scholars who are opposed to war all have in common acceptance of and growing support for the principle of peaceful coexistence.

Despite certain faults and limitations in their interpretation of this principle, their support for it has undeniably a great ideological impact and practical effect. Its most consistent champions in the West (C. Lamont, Bertrand Russell, Erich Fromm, L. Mumford, F. Schuman, H. Hughes, D. Fleming, A. Monk and L. Pauling) see the problem of our age in the stark terms of "Co-existence or Co-destruction?".

Most of them condemn anti-communism and adopt a friendly attitude to the Soviet Union and socialism. Demonstrating great scientific objectiveness and civic courage, they scorn the absurd accusations of the militarists that they are "unpatriotic" and guilty of "treachery". They present all kinds of evidence of the Soviet Union's sincere desire for peace, and the dangers of anti-communism as an instrument of war or a means to war (Mills, Russell, Lamont, Sartre, Pauling and others).

A basic feature of the ideological and moral growth of Western anti-militarist intellectuals is their ever better understanding, in spite of anti-communist propaganda to the contrary, of the fact that the Soviet people and its Communist Party, guided by Lenin's ideas, are sincere and convinced supporters of international peace. In the twenty years since its founding, the World Peace Movement's Lenin Peace Prizes have gained truly world-wide recognition, and have been awarded to people from 51 countries.

Another of these common features is social optimism, the belief that it is possible to prevent world nuclear war and put an end to war altogether, the belief that mankind's future does not necessarily involve the continuation of the extremely costly and highly dangerous arms race, that reason and humanism can prevail in international relations, and that the forces of war are effectively isolated and defeated.

Thus, Bertrand Russell exorts us not to listen to the pessimist, "for if we do, we are traitors to Man's future."[2]

---

[1] Erich Fromm, *May Man Prevail?*, New York, 1961.

[2] B. Russell, *Has Man a Future?*, London, 1961, p. 128.

Yet another of these features is moral integrity, a conscience as impeccably reliable, to borrow a phrase from Hemingway, as the standard metre in Paris. In times of tense international crises brought about by imperialist policies and distorted by Western propaganda, these people have kept their sanity and sense of proportion, their objectiveness and dignity, and have demanded moral and political responsibility of their governments. They have sufficient civic courage to scorn philistine considerations of "personal gain". As Bertrand Russell has put it, these scientists and philosophers have not shown themselves "obedient tools of their governments".[1]

The main material forces on the side of peace and the prevention of nuclear war—the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, the international communist and workers' movement, peace-loving countries and the peace movement—also create, undoubtedly, the chief moral, spiritual forces of the struggle for peace, against aggressors. The increasing activity of intellectuals and scientists in the West directed against the aggressors and their policies, and the influence their ideas have on public opinion in the West are an additional factor of considerable importance in the broad democratic front of the peace movement.

## Condemnation of War and the Arms Race

The analysis of militarism and wars as specific social phenomena occupies a place of increasing importance in the researches of Western philosophers and sociologists who declare themselves for lasting universal peace. Indeed, it could not be otherwise, for any search for ways and means of ensuring peace of necessity sooner or later leads to a battle against militarism and war.

Wright C. Mills is speaking for a large number of Western peace-loving intellectuals when he hits out against all the empty talk about peace current in the West: "To talk about peace without ever talking about the means of war is indeed to be softheaded."[2] Moreover, he insists that: "Insofar as men want peace, they must see to it that these means ("the means of making history", including "armed force and economic

[1] B. Russell, op. cit., p. 134.

[2] Wright C. Mills, *The Causes of World War Three*, New York, 1958, p. 121.

forces".—*A.G.*) are used to bring it about, that they are not made relevant to the drift and thrust toward war."[1]

Several Western scholars are taking steps in the direction of revealing the true causes of modern militarism and war, that lie deeply rooted in the socio-economic and political nature of imperialism and neo-fascism.

Thus, at the time when the world stood on the threshold of the Second World War, the British philosopher Bertrand Russell wrote of the outmodedness of the capitalist "system of private property", and concluded that expansionism, the scramble among the imperialist powers to further their own interests at the expense of the others and to seize one another's possessions was bound to end in "a diplomatic bargain or a war".[2]

The events of the last three decades have given Bertrand Russell a vast fund of facts for even more emphatic general conclusions. Analysing the aggressive war waged by the United States in Vietnam, he speaks out against the criminal aim of American imperialism for world domination, and calls upon the peoples of Europe and America to curb the militarists.

Western scholars are becoming increasingly aware of the doubtful motives that are pursued by the monopolies and magnates in encouraging the militarisation of science and technology. Thus, Norbert Wiener speaks of the sin of "using the magic of modern automatisation to further personal profit or let loose the apocalyptic terrors of nuclear warfare."[3]

The American sociologist L. Mumford, among others, points out the harmfulness of war to society in view of the tremendous waste it involves. "The institution of war is such a large-scale perversion...." "With the very advance of civilisation war became a collective drama...." "In modern times this monstrous negation of values has captured and drained off energies that should have gone to the culture of cities and the development of man".[4]

The evil and futility of war lies not only in the colossal squandering of energies it involves. As the more sober-minded representatives of their society, the anti-militarist scholars in

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Bertrand Russell, *Which Way to Peace?*, Plymouth, 1936, pp. 17, 75.

[3] Norbert Wiener, *God and Golem*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1964, p. 52.

[4] Lewis Mumford, *The Conduct of Life*, London, 1952, p. 129.

the West show that wars, far from removing the contradictions of capitalism, only serve to increase them greatly. "Wars have indeed aggravated all our difficulties today,"[1] remarks L. Mumford.

The well-known American philosopher C. Lamont warns capitalist ruling circles that: "The Third World War would most certainly create more problems than it solved; and would leave mankind in a bitter, disorganised, economically chaotic state which would in all likelihood lead to future wars and revolutions."[2]

Western anti-militarist scholars lay special emphasis on the absurdity of "a first-class H-bomb war", as threatening colossal destruction without offering the West any chance of political advantage. But they also condemn the policy of "local wars", for the obvious reason that today any one of them could easily lead to an all-out nuclear conflict. Mumford, for example, suggests ceasing to prepare for war against Russia and avert a total catastrophe while it is still possible.[3]

Western anti-militarist scholars give a great deal of attention to the economic aspects of the problem of war and peace. The policy of militarism, the arms race and the waging of aggressive wars paralyses the development of many major spheres of human activity, and involves a tremendous waste of human and material resources. The increasing militarisation of the economies of the USA and its satellites in the NATO and other military blocs does not in fact serve to ensure that they flourish as Western propaganda would have people believe. On the contrary, it inevitably entails exacerbation of the economic contradictions of the capitalist system, and the masses are forced to bear the onerous burden of exhorbitant military expenditure.

Anti-militarist scientists have proved beyond doubt that atomic and thermonuclear explosions have already caused people serious harm in the form of radiation sickness. A large-scale nuclear war would cause irreparable genetic damage to human beings, flora and fauna on all continents. World-famous scientists like Einstein, Born and Albert Schweitzer (in the famous series of lectures "Peace or Atomic War?") and many others have therefore openly condemned nuclear war on the basis of irrefutable facts, and branded as a crime

[1] Lewis Mumford, op. cit., p. 13.
[2] C. Lamont, *Soviet Civilisation*, New York, 1952, p. 363.
[3] L. Mumford, *The Art of the Impossible*, pp. 9, 29.

the sanctioning by the US ruling circles of the dropping of atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.[1] Today, anti-militarist scientists in the West are issuing numerous declarations, articles and protests against the American use of weapons of mass destruction (lethal chemical substances and napalm bombs against the Vietnamese).

The fact that scientific and technological progress is channelled to military purposes by the Western power élite and the very system of capitalism, and the great danger this represents, was pointed out at the World Congress for Peace in 1949: "Science, whose role is to ensure the happiness of mankind, is being diverted from its goal and is forced to serve the ends of war".[2]

Einstein, for instance, regards the "economic anarchy" of capitalist society producing "an oligarchy of private capital the enormous power of which cannot be effectively checked..." to be "the real source of the evil".[3] Socialism, on the contrary, is deeply interested in preserving peace. Einstein rejects the reactionary idea spread by anti-communist propaganda that the Soviet Union today is a militarist state, similar in many respects to nazi Germany, and believes them to be very different, particularly "as to basic aims and goals".[4] He referred to the nazis as a "bunch of thugs" who would "get their deserts", and was equally scathing in his criticism of those responsible for Munich sell-out.

Leading Western scientists point to the fact that in their countries, and particularly in the USA, "there are large industries and numerous businesses that make money out of arms". There are active forces there who "have a personal interest in the preparation and, if necessary, the waging of war".[5] "Accordingly," the outstanding American sociologist W. Mills declares, "an attack on war-making is also an attack on the US power élite."[6]

The actions of the economic and political power élite of the USA in the post-war years exposed them to the judgement of

---

[1] See S. Melman, *Our Depleted Society*, New York, 1965; Albert Einstein, *Philosopher-Scientist*. The Library of Living Philosophers, p. 656.

[2] Supplement to *New Times*, No. 19, May 4, 1949, Moscow, p. 52.

[3] Albert Einstein, "Why Socialism?" *Monthly Review*, New York, June 1955, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 48, 49.

[4] Albert Einstein, *Philosopher-Scientist*, op. cit., p. 657.

[5] M. Born. op. cit., p. 219.

[6] W. Mills, *The Causes of World War Three*, pp. 120-21.

history as responsible for international crises fraught with nuclear disaster.

As Professor Wheelwright, member of the Peace Committee, observed, as soon as the forces of peace got the upper hand in the UN, the US Government ignored the United Nations completely in conducting its aggressive policy. US ruling circles act counter to the aspirations for freedom of the peoples of the former colonial countries. Professor Wheelwright calls on people to use every available method to make the American leaders realise that "the world has changed in the last twenty years".[1]

Western scientists are undertaking more and more energetic actions in this direction. An example was the much-publicised refusal of Jean-Paul Sartre to go to the USA as a protest against the American war in Vietnam. In his article "Why I did not go to America", Sartre referred to the war in Vietnam as "a clear, frank, overt, typical act of aggression, for which there is neither justification nor any serious alibi." Sartre puts his finger on the reactionary character of American policy when he says: "... the American intervention in North Vietnam, should be regarded in the context of American foreign policy as a whole. It is not merely a question of Vietnam. If the Americans are driven out of Saigon, it will entail consequences throughout the third world, and will eventually lead to upheavals in Latin America. The aim is to forcefully preserve the whole system of exploitation."[2]

Under the impact of the events of recent history and current affairs, more and more Western scientists are coming to condemn anti-communism as an instrument of war and a force preparing a nuclear disaster. As F. Schuman points out, since the emergence of the Soviet Union, the fiercest wars have been the result of "anti-Communist military attacks upon the USSR".[3] In the USSR and the other socialist countries, on the other hand, militarism and aggression have never been used as a means of solving internal and international problems. Soviet leaders have never acted rashly and improvidently in international affairs, but have always "cultivated peace and trade" with the Western Powers.[4]

---

[1] E. L. Wheelwright, "Hiroshima or the U.N. Which Road for Mankind?" *Peace Action in Australia*, 1965, Vol. 7, No. 5, pp. 6, 7.

[2] *Izvestia*, April 5, 1965.

[3] F. Schuman, *International Politics*, p. 501.

[4] Ibid., p. 502.

Even those democratic scientists, scholars and public figures in the West who are far from embracing Marxism and communism are becoming more and more articulate in condemning the reactionary doctrine "justifying" war in the name of anti-communism. Intellectuals and peoples realise that anti-communism means war.

Among the more prominent intellectuals who indicate to the relationship between cold war and anti-communism, special mention should be made of Bertrand Russell, Albert Einstein, D. Fleming, W. Mills, Jean-Paul Sartre, J. Sommerville, F. Schuman, Erich Fromm, J. Morray, C. Lamont, L. Mumford and H. Hughes.

The idea that it is militarism and anti-communism that engender cold war, local imperialist and neo-colonialist wars runs like a scarlet thread through the vast majority of intelligent works devoted to the cold war and the numerous acts of aggression committed by the Western Powers.

The eminent American historian D. F. Fleming, by the very title of his book *The Cold War and Its Origins: 1917-1960,* draws the reader's attention to the fact that the source of the cold war is to be sought in the historic turning point of the 1917 Revolution.[1] Keeping strictly to irrefutable historical facts, Professor Fleming analyses the whole history of the cold war of the capitalist countries against the Soviet state. He writes how after the October Revolution the USA, Germany, Britain, Japan and other countries organised armed intervention which was only repelled as the result of enormous efforts and sacrifices. This marked the actual beginning of the cold war of international anti-communism against the Soviet State, which has gone on year in year out ever since, although the term "cold war" was not introduced until after the Second World War. Western ideologists and politicians who themselves contribute to the cold war are also wont to regard October 1917 as its origin and cause.[2]

Rejecting the anti-communist claim that the cold war was initiated by the Soviet Union, Professor Fleming points out that from the very first, Lenin declared the very opposite course, the course of peaceful coexistence:

---

[1] Fleming D. F., *The Cold War and Its Origins: 1917-1960,* New York, 1956.

[2] See, for example, D. Donnelly's *Struggle for the World. The Cold War: 1917-1965,* New York, 1965.

"Let American capitalists not touch us; we will not touch them".[1]

Many progressive Western intellectuals share the view that the cold war is a major weapon against democracy, and that if continued, it will eventually stifle all democracy in the USA and other Western countries.[2]

Western progressive intellectuals are growing more and more openly critical of such inevitable attributes of the cold war as the arms race, the essentially aggressive "strategy of deterrence", increased taxation and violation of democratic freedoms. Even among the faithful supporters of the official ideology of the West there is a growing realisation that the USA is not in a position to dictate its selfish will to other states and force its own wishes upon the peoples of the world.[3] War and the forces of war are condemned by the peoples of the world and by history.

## Western Intellectuals on the Ways of Achieving Lasting Peace

All significant works by Western anti-militarist intellectuals propound the idea that stable universal peace would be to the advantage of all nations, capitalist or socialist, and call for a great collective effort by all peoples to achieve it.

In his *Common Sense and Nuclear War*, Bertrand Russell appeals to the common sense of peoples and governments, and sets out "to show possible means of achieving peace in ways which should be equally acceptable. . . ."[4] As Russell rightly points out, both social systems should base their relations on the existing possibilities of preserving peace and the pressing need for common measures to ensure their mutual security.

Western anti-militarist intellectuals realise that a long period of peace will ensure new achievements in the building of socialism and communism, and reject outright the absurd argument of anti-communist ideologists and politicians that a nuclear war is "desirable" on the grounds that peace is to

---

[1] D. F. Fleming, *The Cold War and Its Origins: 1917-1960*, Vol. I, p. 537.

[2] H. H. Ransom, *Can American Democracy Survive the Cold War?*, New York, 1964, pp. XI, XIV, 353.

[3] A. Etzioni, *Winning Without War*, New York, 1965, pp. XI-XIII, 244.

[4] B. Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*, op. cit., p. 7.

the advantage of the Communists. Thus, C. Lamont writes: "...international peace, disarmament and a normal exchange of goods on the world market would be beneficial for the Communist nations. But to reject these aims on this account is to negate the processes of reason. For plainly the fulfilment of such goals would also be immensely beneficial to America and the rest of the non-Communist world."[1]

Western anti-militarists are generally agreed on the fact that peace can and must be achieved purely on a democratic basis of complete equality between nations, great and small, and on no account as a result of the major powers forcing their dictates on the weaker countries.

Bertrand Russell insists that international peace should be achieved without sacrifices and concessions by individual nations, or infringement on their vital interests. Provided this attitude is observed, he sees no obstacles to the achievement of lasting peace acceptable to all countries.[2]

This attitude involves condemnation of the idea of "peace based on force" which is extremely current among militant politicians and irresponsible "Sovietologists" in the West.

Many Western philosophers and sociologists label their views on peace "conceptions", "doctrines" and "strategies", elaborating them in an extremely pretentious form and claiming that only their own particular ideas can save the world from thermonuclear war (viz. "the doctrine of world government", "the new gradualist strategy of peace", and so on). As for the anti-militarist scholars and scientists they refrain from giving their views high-flown names, and make a serious attempt to examine the role of concrete factors in the achievement of peace.

A vitally important task today is that of achieving total, universal disarmament under a system of strict controls, and this is one of the main directions in which Western anti-militarist intellectuals are investigating the possibilities of ensuring peace.

Their views generally have the following basic features in common: the form in which they view the question of disarmament, their serious arguments showing the need for universal disarmament, their correct analysis and high opinion of the position of the USSR as opposed to that of the USA, the FRG and other Western powers, and intelligent criticism of the

---

[1] C. Lamont, *Soviet Civilisation*, op. cit., pp. 386-87.

[2] B. Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*, p. 7.

numerous "theories" justifying the arms race that are current in the West.

They regard the question of disarmament as a major problem of our time;[1] the complete destruction of the monstrous weapons of the second half of the twentieth century is the chief means of preventing a nuclear war, an absolute necessity and the main path to real peace on earth for all nations;[2] not palliatives, not arms control, not even the "freezing" of nuclear stockpiles are the answer—"the first steps in avoiding a nuclear cataclysm and preserving democracy are to agree on universal disarmament."[3]

The arguments they put forward can largely be summed up in two main ones: the terrible devastating power of nuclear weapons, and secondly, the harmful results the arms race entails for the Western countries. The latter not only serves to exacerbate the basic contradictions of Western society, being detrimental to the bulk of the population, but threatens to destroy all vestiges of democracy and leads to the dominance of Right-wing militarist forces. This latter argument is presented most convincingly by Bertrand Russell, W. Mills and several others. Erich Fromm points out that a society following the road of mutual threats cannot be expected to preserve its democratic character.[4]

Western anti-militarist intellectuals began to call for disarmament and the liquidation of nuclear weapons and effective international control shortly after the Second World War when the USA was conducting a policy of "nuclear blackmail". L. Mumford presented a detailed system of practical measures for US disarmament in his *Programme for Survival* as early as 1946. He insisted that the American Government, the President and Congress should undertake the following measures without delay in the interests of the whole world.

1. Declare readiness to submit to a complete system of United Nations' inspection and control of atomic weapons and atomic energy.
2. Stop further manufacture of atomic bombs.
3. Dismantle the bombs America had made and place her stockpile of fissionable materials under United Nations' guard,

---

[1] *Problems of World Disarmament*, Boston, 1963, pp. 1-11.
[2] S. Chase, *Live and Let Live*, New York, 1960, p. 135.
[3] E. Fromm, *May Man Prevail?*, p. 248.
[4] Ibid., p. 207.

as a proof of moral unwillingness to use the bombs in a surprise attack against any nation.[1]

If the United States had adopted this programme twenty years ago instead of forcing the arms race on the Soviet Union, the socialist countries, and all mankind, the threat of atomic destruction would not hang over the world today and tremendous material values now being expended on the arms race could be used in the interests of the peoples of the world and social progress.

Bertrand Russell insists on the need for universal disarmament and unmasks the "hypocrisy of the official attitude". He criticises the "theory", current in the West and especially in the USA, that "disarmament might cause a disastrous economic dislocation", and shows how ridiculous and paradoxical it is to believe that "we can only keep alive by preparing to kill each other". He points out that this attitude is reactionary and "fostered by those who are interested in the armament industry." This "theory", intended to discredit disarmament and deceive people, is completely unfounded. As Russell says, experience at the end of the Second World War "showed the possibility of a smooth transition from a war economy to a peace economy."[2]

The American sociologist and philosopher S. Chase insists that peace must triumph in the world since the only alternative is nuclear destruction. He considers of paramount importance the elaboration of a programme for transferring the US economy to a peace footing, though he recognises that the process of diverting the capitalist economy and the whole US social organisation into peaceful channels would be an extremely complicated and painful process in view of the anarchy of capitalist production, the lack of planning at a national level and the dependency of the whole economy on the policy of militarism. Nevertheless, he convincingly shows that peaceful coexistence with the USSR and disarmament is the only sensible policy for the United States to adopt.[3]

All the anti-militarist intellectuals are agreed that general and complete disarmament is a vital necessity in our time, and would guarantee peace and ensure the solution of major social problems. A basic stimulus to the further struggle of

---

[1] L. Mumford, *Programme for Survival*, London, 1946, p. 67.
[2] See B. Russell, *Has Man a Future?*, London, 1961, pp. 129-30.
[3] S. Chase, *Live and Let Live*, New York, 1960.

progressive intellectuals against war is their conviction that peace is an absolutely essential condition for a qualitatively new stage in the development of world science, directing scientific and technological progress along non-military avenues. Soviet scientists are convinced that given international peace "the conditions for intercourse and exchange of ideas between scientists of the world would be greatly improved and this would provide the basis for an unprecedented flourishing of science and rapid progress".[1]

The "gradualist approach" to peace is widely advertised in American sociology as "the American road to peace". What is the essence of this fundamentally anti-military theory, involving criticism of US militarist policy? What sensible ideas does it contain, and what are its limitations and shortcomings?

The founder and most ardent champion of the "gradualist theory" is the American sociologist Amitai Etzioni. Today he is a research associate of the Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University. He expounded his theory in two works. He first presented it in *The Hard Way to Peace. A New Strategy* and later "considerably extended and updated it" in *Winning Without War*. In point of fact, however, the latter work is very much inferior and omits several of the sensible ideas contained in the former.

The gradualist theory is intended as a detailed socio-political programme for the gradual, step-by-step transition from international tension, the arms race and the cold war to mutual understanding especially between the USSR and the USA, controlled disarmament, international co-operation and lasting peace. Professor Etzioni makes concrete suggestions as to how this may be achieved, which, although not new or original, can be generally regarded as positive and anti-militarist. The gradualist theory is propounded as an all-embracing programme, containing a new policy for speeding up the modernisation of the underdeveloped countries and proposals for the formation of a world-wide community and a new United Nations, and a new political strategy for eliminating poverty, illiteracy and disease. In respect of the latter, the gradualist conception is a typical example of the numerous utopias to be found in post-war American sociology and has absolutely no practical value.

---

[1] *The USSR, USA and Disarmament* (in Russian), Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1967, p. 191.

The idea that peace is to be identified with preserving the *status quo*, a view held by many Western intellectuals, is false and unrealistic. Although their subjective intentions may be, and often are, perfectly sincere, objectively the idea is fundamentally utopian and only serves to hinder the progressive struggle of peoples for their freedom and independence against imperialism and neo-colonialism. More and more progressive intellectuals are coming to understand the dialectical relationship between real peace and the struggle of peoples against the forces of war and coercion. Thus, Jean-Paul Sartre correctly noted the interdependence of peace and the freedom of peoples when he said: "We want to ensure peace through freedom and return peoples their freedom through peace."[1]

Along with realistic ideas for preventing wars and ensuring lasting peace, Western scientists and scholars advance many ideas which do not reflect the real conditions and objective tendencies of social development at all, and are even wholly incompatible with them.

The most obvious and typical example of such utopian ideas is the theory of "world government" as the best way to ensure lasting peace.[2] The wide currency and popularity this theory has enjoyed for decades now calls for serious critical analysis of its essentials, all the more so because it has been championed by such ardent supporters of peace among Western intellectuals as Bertrand Russell, L. Mumford, and Erich Fromm and numerous outstanding scientists, for example, Albert Einstein.

The utopian views of anti-militarist intellectuals, for all their incompatibility with real conditions, are not to be confused with the aggressive "doctrine" of US ruling circles, who exploit the idea of "world government" in the interests of their policy of "world domination".

One of the most wide-spread weaknesses of the various peace programmes presented by Western intellectuals is that they are based on abstract humanitarian principles. Take the following statement by L. Pauling, for example: "I believe that there is a greater power in the world than the evil power of military force, of nuclear bombs—there is the power of *good*, of *morality*, of *humanitarianism*."[3]

---

[1] L'Assemblée Mondiale de la Paix. Helsinki, 22-29, Juin, 1955.—Supplement au numéro 50-51 de la revue *Horizons*, Août 1955, p. 8.

[2] This is dealt with in the chapter "National Sovereignty and War".

[3] Linus Pauling, *No More War!*, London, 1956, p. 193.

Many Western scientists, scholars and public figures who support peace are becoming more and more convinced of the advantages of peaceful coexistence both as theory and practice. Although they tend to give it a limited interpretation—as an alternative to war—they are nonetheless coming to realise the historical prospects and necessity of this policy, and to regard it as a sensible form of international relations, beneficial to socialist and capitalist countries alike. They realise that peaceful coexistence is a necessity dictated by objective conditions—the only real alternative being a thermonuclear disaster. Western progressive intellectuals present this idea in various forms, but the underlying message is the same. "Co-existence or co-destruction" is C. Lamont's way of posing the problem.[1] While M. Born says: "Bertrand Russel is right if he never tires of repeating: Our choice is only between Co-existence and Non-existence."[2]

It is perfectly natural that progressives in the West should support peaceful coexistence, since it is in the interests of all humanity with the exception of political reactionaries, the military clique, and the monopolies with a vested interest in the arms race—in short the various forces pursuing selfish, anti-social aims.

The Western intellectuals who see the policy of peaceful coexistence as the road to universal peace are ardent supporters of the peace movement and opponents of reaction and war.

It is the duty of Marxist philosophers to continue to objectively examine and support the anti-war ideas and practical peace programmes of Western anti-militarist scholars, point out the positive elements they contain and show how it is possible to overcome the frequent inconsistencies and social utopian features they contain.

The present struggle for peace and social progress against the threat of war is not only a ceaseless ideological and political struggle against the forces of reaction and obscurantism and the ideology and policy of war and anti-communism, it also involves universal solidarity with and support for those anti-war movements and ideas which are declaring themselves in an ever more resolute fashion throughout the world.

---

[1] A chapter heading (pp. 355-411) in C. Lamont's *Soviet Civilisation.*

[2] M. Born, op. cit., p. 221.

## Chapter XVIII

# THE PUGWASH MOVEMENT

A feature of the development of international social movements today is the greatly increased role and influence of scientists. This is especially true of movements for peace and disarmament in which scientists play a role out of all proportion to their numerical strength among the supporters of such movements. This is partly a reflection of the generally increased role of science in modern life, but there are also certain more specific reasons.

The first of these reasons is that scientists are more aware than most people of the terrible consequences of a thermonuclear war. Today, thermonuclear weapons exist that possess thousands of times the destructive power of the first atomic bombs dropped by the Americans on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945. Physicists, biologists, medical experts and other scientists are in a position by virtue of their own work and knowledge to fully realise, explain and show to others the terrible consequences involved in the use of this monstrous weapon of destruction.

The second reason is that states make wide use of science in working out the strategy and tactics of modern warfare and in the creation of new destructive weapons, while the objective necessity of eliminating war demands that science play an active role in the development of peaceful relations between states, in producing a strategy and effective instruments of peace and international security.

The first of our two factors explains the emergence of an international movement of scientists devoting special attention to problems of disarmament and co-operation—the Pugwash Movement. The second factor accounts for the growing amount of scientific research into the problems of peace in various countries over the last few years, which already makes it possible to speak of the birth of a new branch of scientific research—peace studies.

Since it is clearly impossible in the limited space available here to analyse all the numerous questions of the whole complex subject of the relationship between international science and peace and disarmament, we shall confine ourselves to examining the two above-mentioned factors and their consequences.

* * *

The fact that we have chosen to pay special attention to the Pugwash Movement does not mean that we ignore the active role scientists are playing in numerous other social movements. Thus, a large group of leading scientists of several countries are members of the World Peace Movement, in the framework of which an active role is played by the World Federation of Scientific Workers (WFSW), with some 200,000 members in 19 countries. However, the Pugwash Movement attracts our attention as being the only social movement actually founded by scientists, composed exclusively of scientists, and concerned specifically with problems of international security, disarmament and co-operation.

The Pugwash Movement is a widely representative movement, including in its ranks scientists of various countries, socialist and capitalist, and of different philosophical and political views. It enjoys considerable authority, and even the governments of several capitalist countries that conduct a policy having little in common with peace and co-operation are forced to reckon with it.

Although natural scientists, and particularly nuclear physicists form the core of the Pugwash Movement—this is a direct result of the first factor mentioned above, determining the special role of scientists in movements for peace and disarmament—specialists in the social and political sciences also play an active role.

Such outstanding scientists of our age as Albert Einstein, Frederick Joliot-Curie, Bertrand Russell, Max Born and Linus

Pauling were among the founders of the Pugwash Movement and nursed it through its early stages. On July 9, 1955, these scientists issued a Manifesto in London, calling upon the scientists of the world and progressives everywhere to declare their opposition to world war as a means of solving political disputes and insist on their settlement by negotiation.[1] The scientists who signed, or actively supported, the Russell-Einstein Manifesto, as it was called, first met in conference in the house of the well-known businessman and public figure Mr. Cyrus Eaton, at Pugwash, Nova Scotia. Present were 22 scientists from 10 countries (USSR, USA, Britain, France, the Chinese People's Republic, Japan, Poland, Austria, Canada and Australia). They elected a Continuing Committee, whose members were Bertrand Russell (Britain), D. V. Skobeltsyn (USSR), E. Rabinovich (USA), J. Rotblat and S. Powell (Britain).

The history of the Pugwash Movement is essentially the history of its conferences. It was not without reason that the Secretary-General of the Pugwash Continuing Committee, Professor J. Rotblat entitled his book on history of the movement: *History of the Pugwash Conferences.*[2]

The Third International Pugwash Conference of Scientists, held in the Tyrolese town of Kitzbühel and in Vienna (September 14-20, 1958), issued the Vienna Statement, a document of major importance stating the need to end wars and the arms race, promote international scientific co-operation and ensure that technology was used in the service of peace.[3]

In December, 1958 the Pugwash Continuing Committee decided to poll scientists on their attitude to the problems of war and peace. The questionnaire included questions about the responsibility of scientists and whether they considered the Vienna Statement a suitable basis for the international scientific co-operation. Over 80 per cent of the scientists of countries (other than the USSR) to which the questionnaire was sent—some 10,000—expressed their support for the Vienna Statement. In the USSR, all 5,000 Soviet scientists polled fully approved of the Statement.

The Fifth Pugwash Conference, held at Pugwash, Canada

---

[1] B. Russell, *The Early History of the Pugwash Movement.* "Disarmament: Its Politics and Economics", pp. 18-21.

[2] J. Rotblat, *Science and World Affairs. History of the Pugwash Conferences,* London, 1962.

[3] *International Affairs,* Moscow, November 1958, No. 11, pp. 80-83.

(August 24-29, 1959), was especially devoted to biological and chemical warfare.[1]

One of the most important of the Pugwash Conferences was the Sixth, held in Moscow (November 27-December 5, 1960), which discussed problems of disarmament and international security. It was attended by 74 scientists from 15 countries. By far the largest delegation was the American, which included several scientific advisors to President Kennedy (J. Wiesner and P. Doty). Some fifty speeches were made on a wide range of questions concerning various aspects of the problem of disarmament: the history of the arms race and disarmament talks, the stage reached in nuclear test ban talks, international security, the plan for general disarmament, political, economic and technical aspects of disarmament, preventing surprise attack, control of nuclear delivery vehicles, and the role and responsibility of scientists. A Statement was issued on the need for disarmament.[2]

The Tenth Pugwash Conference (London, September 3-7, 1962) made a valuable contribution to agreement on disarmament by proposing that existing national means of detecting nuclear explosions should be supplemented by automatic control stations ("black boxes", as they were called), which would be sealed by an international control body and placed in an agreed quantity in various parts of the world. This would have served to remove the need for special inspection bodies to check that nuclear test ban agreements were being carried out.

The Tenth Pugwash Conference passed two important documents—a Statement and a Programme. Those present, from East and West alike, agreed that general and complete disarmament was a prime necessity, and that the whole activity of the movement should be devoted to this end. The first step to general and complete disarmament should be the destruction of existing nuclear delivery vehicles in conjunction with a considerable reduction in conventional weapons and armed forces, and the simultaneous dismantling of all military bases on foreign territory. The Conference elected a new, much enlarged Continuing Committee.[3]

The Eleventh Pugwash Conference (held in Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, September 20-25, 1963) discussed the destruction

[1] Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist, Chicago, October 1959, Vol. XI, No. 8, pp. 337-39.

[2] *Вестник Академии Наук СССР*, 1961, № 1, pp. 84-85.

[3] Ibid., 1962, № 11, pp. 100-04.

of all existing nuclear delivery vehicles, with the exception of a minimum deterrent, or "umbrella" force to be placed under joint US-Soviet control for the purpose of preventing any country from committing aggression with missiles or other weapons concealed during the process of general disarmament.[1]

The Pugwash scientists condemned the proposed creation of a NATO multi-lateral force and all other forms of nuclear proliferation. They condemned the American aggression in Vietnam, and particularly American use of chemical weapons there. General and detailed proposals were made for international scientific co-operation.

The above summary of the history of the Pugwash Movement allows us to draw several conclusions.

Firstly, the Pugwash Movement makes a detailed survey of the whole problem of disarmament, both partial measures and general and complete disarmament, analysing these matters in relation to problems of international security and scientific co-operation. Since those involved in the movement are leading scientists—in many cases in the field of nuclear physics and other natural sciences—they have been able to offer important practical suggestions. At the same time, it was inherent in the logic of the movement that it should extend its attention to all problems of major importance at a given stage of the peace and disarmament movement.

Secondly, the importance and authority of the Pugwash Movement has steadily increased. The movement has grown over the years from discussions between a small group of scientists in the private house of Cyrus Eaton, to a world-wide forum of scientists whose views carry great weight and who are well-known to the public at large.

Thirdly, although the Pugwash Movement remains outside the World Peace Movement, in many respects it pursues the same aims and advances the same demands, in its sincere, conscientious attempts to seek constructive methods of solving problems of peace and disarmament.

Soviet scientists have been playing an active part in the Pugwash Movement since its inception. They consistently support the programme of general and complete disarmament, the implementation of measures to end the arms race and

---

[1] *Disarmament and Arms Control.* An International Quarterly Journal, Vol. 2, No. 1, Winter 1963/64, p. 91.

reduce international tension. They have frequently taken part in discussions with American and other Western scientists in the movement.

It is a tradition of the Pugwash Movement that the actual course of discussions at conferences is not made public. Without violating this tradition, we can say of the views expressed by Pugwash scientists in their discussions that despite the many differences of opinion taken together they represent support for the idea of general and complete disarmament, for the implementation of already practicable agreements on measures to end the arms race. This is the important contribution of the Pugwash Movement to the quest for peace.

* * *

The last decade has seen the appearance in many countries of numerous research centres and institutes for peace and disarmament studies.

According to a UNESCO report based on the work of one of these centres—the International Peace Research Institute in Oslo—by the end of 1965 there were 83 such centres employing a total of 2,500 research workers.

Let us take a look at a few of them. The World Peace Movement founded the International Institute for Peace in Vienna, which works to co-ordinate peace and disarmament studies in different countries and publishes a bulletin and numerous other publications.

There are several institutes of peace studies in the socialist countries. In the Soviet Union, research work on peaceful coexistence, disarmament and other aspects of the peaceful foreign policy of the USSR and other socialist countries is carried on in various branches of the Academy of Sciences, including the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, the Institute of the History of the USSR, the State and Law Institute, the Institute of Philosophy, the Institute of Eastern Studies, the Africa Institute, the Latin America Institute and the USA Institute. The task of co-ordinating all disarmament studies falls to a Commission for Disarmament Studies set up by the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences. The Commission has wide ties with researchers in the field in other countries.

Peace studies are also conducted at various higher educational establishments, including the Moscow State Institute for

Foreign Relations, and several universities and law colleges.

The many research institutes and higher educational establishments where peace studies are carried on in the other socialist countries include the Polish Institute of International Affairs, the Institute of International Politics and Economics in Czechoslovakia, the German Institute for Contemporary History in the German Democratic Republic, and the Institute of World Economics and World Politics in Yugoslavia.

The intensive work conducted in this field in the socialist countries is a reflection of the genuine desire for peace and disarmament of the governments and peoples of the socialist community.

The vast majority of research centres for peace and disarmament studies in the capitalist countries are very small, with only a handful of permanent research workers on their staff. They tend to work on a shoe-string budget and rely largely on donations to make ends meet. They include the Polemological Institute in Groningen (Holland), the International Institute of Peace Studies in Oslo, several centres in Britain, Canada, Denmark, India and Japan, the Society for Peace Studies in the Federal Republic of Germany, and an International Peace Institute founded and financed by the Swedish Government.

In the United States there are several research centres ostensibly engaged in peace studies, the majority of which are in fact concerned with military strategy and arms rather than disarmament. There are naturally many scientists in the USA genuinely concerned over the problems of peace and making a serious study of the subject. Their work is examined in detail in other chapters of the present book.

Peace studies have become so wide-spread that there are now two international organisations of researchers in the field—the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) and the International Peace Research Society (IPRS).

The various institutes and centres for peace studies founded in various countries in the last few years present rather a motley assortment. But the fact remains that almost simultaneously in different parts of the world numerous centres were founded for the purpose of answering a major question of our age: how to ensure international peace, security and disarmament?

This can hardly have been a coincidence: it was a natural phenomenon, called to life by the objective requirements of

present-day social relations. Life itself has placed the problem of war and peace at the very centre of world politics, and any constructive policy today must be based on studies of this problem.

It should be realised that genuine science can only be based on the Marxist-Leninist approach. It is no accident that it is the researches of Marxist-Leninist social science in this field that are producing true scientific results that can serve as a basis for political decisions. The idealist and eclectical approach that underlies non-Marxist science hampers true research and prevents many bourgeois scholars from conducting a truly scientific analysis of problems of war and peace.

* * *

The attention of the scientists of the world is being drawn more and more towards the problems of war and peace. Both practical activity and theoretical studies are being undertaken for the purpose of solving these problems. An example of the former is the participation of scientists in social movements such as the World Peace Movement and the Pugwash Movement; of the latter it is the remarkable development of peace and disarmament studies in various countries leading to the emergence of a new independent field of research.

Both are important social phenomena, typical of our time. It is in the logic of history that the quest for the solution of problems of such vital importance to mankind should be joined by more and more social groups, including the progressive scientists of the world.

## Chapter XIX

# THE SOVIET DISARMAMENT PROGRAMME AND ITS CRITICS

Today, the arms race launched by imperialism has assumed unprecedented proportions. Imperialism has placed the vast resources of the technological revolution in the service of militarism. The technological revolution has brought about a colossal increase in the destructive capacity of the instruments of war. The stock-piles of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons that already exist in the world are enough to threaten the very existence of human society, and the stock-piling and development of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction continues. The arms race has become a major source of international tension, greatly increasing the danger of a world war. All this makes the problem of disarmament one of vital importance to mankind in our day and age.

Imperialism makes wide use of the policy of militarism against the masses, for the suppression of national liberation movements and interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states. Aggressive groups in the imperialist camp have been resorting to armed force more and more frequently of late, to maintain, and where possible expand their sphere of domination and put the brakes on progress. To this end they are trying to step up the arms race, activising military blocs, launching local wars and carrying out other militarist actions designed to undermine international peace and security.

Preparations for war place an intolerable economic burden on the masses, lead to the squandering of national resources

and hold back socio-economic progress. Disarmament has thus become an indispensible condition for the further progress of mankind. General and complete disarmament under effective international control would be the answer to the problem of curbing the shock forces of imperialist aggression and reaction.

Is there a real possibility of achieving general disarmament? Marxists-Leninists have no hesitation in answering in the affirmative. The theory of scientific socialism from the outset connected the possibility of preventing wars and reducing armaments with action on the part of the masses and all progressive social forces. The founders of scientific socialism rejected the fatalistic approach to the assessment of the concrete processes of social development, and pointed to the need to conduct anti-militarist activities in the conditions of capitalism and the possibility of solving the practical questions of struggle against the burden of arms.

Today, the Marxist demand for disarmament has been enriched with new concrete content and its importance is greater than ever. New possibilities have arisen for its solution. This can be deduced from the scientific analysis of the tendencies of the present age, taking careful account of the main trends of world development, the relationship of class forces in the world, and various other relevant material and moral factors. The possibility of achieving disarmament exists today because imperialism and the militarism engendered by it have lost their dominant role in international relations, while socialism has become the decisive factor of world development.

For the first time in history powerful organised forces are demanding disarmament: the Soviet Union, which has taken the lead in decisive branches of science and technology; the other socialist countries, who have placed their economic and political might in the service of peace; the international labour movement and Communist parties throughout the world, who consider it their first duty to save mankind from the horrors of a new world war and put an end to war; the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, who are vitally interested in preserving peace; national liberation movements, throwing off the chains of imperialism and colonialism, and the world peace movement uniting in its ranks people of various social position, political opinions and religious convictions. The growth and consolidation of these progressive social factors, their unity and solidarity, improves the prospects for progress in the question of disarmament.

The events of the last few years have confirmed the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist definition of the character of the present age, its content and major trends: namely, that the main course of mankind's development is determined by the world socialist system, the international working class and all other revolutionary forces. The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow, 1969, expressed the opinion that in view of the changes that have taken place in the world during the last decade stable peace is no longer an utopian dream but a perfectly attainable aim and appealed to the peoples to struggle hard for general and complete disarmament.

On the basis of the theory of scientific socialism that international disarmament of states under international control is perfectly feasible, for years the Soviet Union, supported by the other socialist countries, has been waging a ceaseless struggle for the attainment of universal peace.

The first steps towards limiting and stopping the nuclear arms race—the treaty banning nuclear tests in three media (1963), the treaty on the principles governing the activities of states in the exploration and use of outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies (1967), banning the putting of nuclear weapons in orbit around the earth and their placement in outer space, the nuclear non-proliferation treaty (1968), the treaty banning the placement of nuclear weapons and other mass annihilation weapons on the sea bed and ocean floor and in their bowels (1971), the agreement between the USSR and the USA on measures to prevent the accidental application of nuclear weapons—convincingly prove that the fight against the arms race can achieve important results. The more actively it is waged, the more difficult does it become for the forces of aggression to torpedo urgent arms limitation measures.

Influential militarist circles in the USA and other imperialist states desperately combat the principal items in the disarmament programme proposed by the Soviet Union. For that purpose they have mobilised scientists, who are willing to serve militarism and believe that the arms race is mankind's only prospect.

Efforts to halt the race in all types of weapons and achieve disarmament occupied a prominent place among the basic tasks set forth in the programme for peace and international security passed by the 24th Congress of the CPSU.

The Congress advanced the following concrete proposals for the accomplishment of these tasks: the conclusion of treaties putting a ban on nuclear, chemical, and bacteriological weapons; an end to the testing of nuclear weapons, including underground tests; the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world; the dismantling of foreign military bases; the reduction of armed forces, especially in Central Europe; the working out of measures reducing the probability of accidental outbreak or deliberate fabrication of armed incidents and their development into international crises, into war; the reduction of military spending, above all by the major powers; the convocation of a conference of the five nuclear powers—the USSR, the USA, the People's Republic of China, France and Britain—with a view to achieving the nuclear disarmament of all states in possession of nuclear weapons, and the convocation of a world conference to consider disarmament questions to their full extent.

The solution of disarmament problems would be facilitated by the implementation of other proposals of the programme, designed to increase international security, namely: the elimination of hotbeds of war in South-East Asia and in the Middle East and a political settlement in these areas on the basis of the legitimate rights of states and peoples subjected to aggression; repudiation of the threat or use of force in settling outstanding issues and the conclusion of appropriate bilateral or regional treaties; the adoption of measures to ensure a radical turn towards a détente and peace in Europe and the convocation and success of an all-European conference; the simultaneous annulment of the Warsaw Treaty and of the North Atlantic alliance or—as a first step—dismantling of their military organisations; full implementation of the UN decisions on the abolition of the remaining colonial regimes; the development of relations of mutually advantageous co-operation in every sphere, including such problems as the conservation of the environment, development of power and other natural resources, development of transport and communications and so on.

Determined action in this direction would substantially facilitate the solution of the cardinal problem of universal, total disarmament, opening a new chapter in the history of human society.

The American sociologists Strausz-Hupé, Kintner and Possony declare general and complete disarmament to be a "fruitless chimera". They write, "We hold that permanent coex-

istence between systems so fundamentally opposed is impossible."[1]

The conception of an unrestrained arms race, which emerged when the USA had a temporary monopoly of the A bomb, and was fostered by Dulles's doctrine of "rolling back" communism and "liberating" the socialist countries, dominated bourgeois sociology and politics for a long time. Some of its main postulates enjoy the favour of some influential politicians representing the social élite even now and hamper all attempts at finding an alternative way.

The super-armament conception is part and parcel of the extremist, adventurist policy pursued by US imperialism. It is an essential component of the socio-political philosophy expounded by rabid reactionaries. It is a conception held by businessmen making a fortune on government war orders, by the leaders of the Right-wing bourgeois political parties (Goldwater, Wallace), by some senators and congressmen, especially members of the Congress Committee on Armed Services, Internal Security (Thurmond, Jackson, Homer, Findley), by prominent researchers of laboratories working on new weapons, research corporations, centres for strategic studies, and also by active members of such ultra-Right organisations as the John Birch Society and the National Security Council.

Psychopathic anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, illusions about the omnipotence of US imperialism and extreme obscurantism nourish the theories about the inevitability of small and big wars and the application of mass-destruction weapons. Such theories form the premise of conceptions about the need for an unrestricted arms race. These conceptions are bound up with the names of the ultra-Right ideologists, such as Burnham, Kahn, Possony, Strausz-Hupé, Tucker and Teller.

The latest variants of the super-armament conception, as applicable to the conditions at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, can be found in the publications of the Georgetown University Center for Strategic Studies, in *Orbis*, a quarterly journal of world affairs, published by the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, as well as in the testimony given by Strausz-Hupé, Teller and Kahn to various US Congress Committees in 1967-69.

---

[1] R. Strausz-Hupé, W. Kintner, S. Possony, *A Forward Strategy for America*, p. 267.

The super-armament champions reject the principle of co-existence with the socialist countries as "incompatible with genuine peace". They declare obsolete the traditional view on aggression, and regard the very existence of the socialist countries and the international communist movement as an act of aggression and a challenge to US interests. The ultra-Right ideologists insist on a policy aimed at securing a "victory over communism" by intensifying military pressure up to and including the delivery of a preventive nuclear strike.

The above theories regard relations between states with different social systems as phases of a military conflict; they reject the prospect of easing tensions, of a normalisation of international relations; they are ready to resolve controversial issues between the socialist and capitalist countries by armed force.

As a rule, the champions of this trend ignore the risk of nuclear war and belittle its consequences. They exaggerate optimistically the possibility of rehabilitating the damages caused by an exchange of nuclear blows. Their recipes are based on the presumption of US military supremacy, and they, therefore, raise an alarm in view of a dynamic strategic equilibrium established between the USA and the USSR.

The ultra-Right ideologists do not wish to tie the hands of the military-industrial complex and therefore ignore the negative consequences entailed by the unrestrained arms race for the USA itself, and categorically object to any steps aimed towards an agreement on its limitation. They endeavour to prove that it is possible to create forces able to strike a successful blow at the opponent and thus to make missile and nuclear war a convenient instrument of imperialist policies.

Robert Kilmarx, a senior staff member of the Center of Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, advocates the building up of the US missile defence system, and of the latest kinds of missiles with multiple independently targeted nuclear warheads. His main concern is that the Soviet-American talks may reduce the scale of military research and development. Kilmarx favours talks with the USSR, but says that those who believe that the USA can insure the sanctity of agreements reached from a level of technological and military inferiority must carry "a heavy cross". He regards arms control as but another field of international conflict. The purposes and rules of such control "must be fully responsive to overall national strategy and supportive of the aims that guide DOD".

"Proceed we must," he says, "however if only to reduce in part the risk of global conflict and open up what may become new avenues to Soviet constraints."[1] Kilmarx is for arms control that would help "... to penetrate and to open Soviet society, to facilitate intelligence overall to spur on liberal trade".[2]

Thus, with him it is not so much a question of halting the arms race and limiting its role in international relations, as it is of opening up new trends in the military-technical competition, of providing advantages to US aggressive circles by imposing on the opponent unfavourable terms in an agreement.

Herman Kahn, the Director of the Hudson Institute, who has joined the polemics on the building up of missile defence and other strategic arms systems, continues to hold a special place among the extremist theoreticians.

His present arguments are but a continuation of his former views, though, at the end of the sixties, he made a somewhat more cautious appraisal of the possibility of making a big thermonuclear war a political instrument. He admits that the pros and cons for a thin BMD System have "really changed dramatically" over the last couple of years, which has led to the loss by the USA of its "strategic advantage" and the emergence of a "strategic parity".[3] This is tantamount to an admission that the main postulate in Kahn's schemes for escalating threats and military conflicts, based on US military superiority, has been shaken. Admitting that a global nuclear conflict would be dangerous for the USA, Kahn does not however draw the logical conclusion that his policy of securing strategic and political advantages through the arms race should, therefore, be discarded. He rejects the only logical alternative to his bankrupt policy—the signing of an agreement to halt the arms race. No, he argues that the way out lies in the launching of a new armament cycle.

Kahn insists that the United States should adopt "competitive mobilisation" for its strategy in the seventies. Its aim is to compel the opponent steeply and steadily to raise the military budget and correspondingly to bring the war machine into a

---

[1] Kilmarx R., "ABM and MIRV in the Context of SALT", *Vital Speeches of the Day*, Vol. XXXVI, July 15, 1970, pp. 602-04.

[2] Ibid., p. 603.

[3] *Strategy and Science: Toward a National Security Policy for the 1970s Hearings before the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Development of the Committee on Foreign Affairs House of Representatives*, Ninety-First Congress, First Session, Washington, 1969, p. 114.

state of complete combat readiness in peacetime conditions. To attain this he proposes that the US war expenditure should be 200,000 million dollars in the first year of the "competitive mobilisation" and reach 500,000 million at the end of the third year. In the course of three years the entire population, industry, and all institutions are to be hidden away in underground shelters, fundamentally new systems of strategic arms are to be developed and a superiority is to be achieved that will make possible an agreement with the USSR (meaning a capitulation of the USSR) or, in the event of war, ensure a better result for the USA. The idea is that the "competitive mobilisation" and the resulting greater combat readiness will make it possible to change the rules of the game, that is, to remove all restraints and enable the USA to resort to tactics of advancing ultimatums.

Note should be taken of the provocative implications of the "competitive mobilisation" conception, which proceeds from the premise that a sharp international crisis is inevitable. Essentially, Kahn implies that US interests would be furthered best of all by the fabrication of such crises, since that would trigger off the "competitive mobilisation" mechanism.

Kahn advertises his conception as a substitute for a war and promises the USA victory if it acts in accordance with his recipes. His plan, Kahn believes, is particularly advantageous because it creates an excellent mechanism for the improvement of military research and development, for exhausting the opponent's economy, and also for getting a "ransom", should the opponent decide to accept the challenge. Kahn's attempt to obtain through a "substitute war" the results which the many years of the cold war were unable to furnish, demonstrates that he has fully lost all sense of reality.

This aspect of Kahn's speculations must not be overlooked because some other military strategists, too, presume that the stepping up of the arms race is able to give the United States an advantage over the Soviet Union. They believe that the West can "bleed" the Soviet economy "by forcing it to keep up with high levels of US arms programmes".[1] The futility of these designs is self-evident. Now that the economic, scientific and technological potentials of the two world systems are more in favour of the Soviet Union than they were twenty or even ten years ago, now that the Soviet economy and science are

[1] *World Politics*, A Quarterly Journal of International Relations, Vol. XXIII, No. 3, April 1971, p. 440.

developing at steady high rates, the defence capacity of the USSR has grown immensely, as has also its ability to defend the international positions of socialism.

Any attempts by the military-industrial complex to act in the international arena on the basis of an unrealistic approach, any attempt to attain "predominant superiority" will be strewed with obstacles more difficult to overcome than at any time before.

The hope of being able to gain an advantage by plunging the world into a new strategic arms race is particularly groundless in the seventies. Moreover, this mode of action is fraught with ruinous consequences notably to the national interests of the United States—to the prospects of placing its economy on a sound basis, and of resolving its pressing social problems at home.

The balance of forces in the world changed in the sixties and the unleashing of a nuclear war by an aggressor will inevitably doom him to extinction. The dynamic strategic equilibrium established between the USSR and the USA has nipped in the bud all attempts at reinstating the traditional policy of using nuclear arms for diplomatic pressure and blackmail.

For this reason a process of regroupment has begun within the ruling classes of the imperialist countries over the question of disarmament. The most sober-minded representatives of the bourgeoisie, realising the disastrous results a thermonuclear war would entail for the ruling classes in imperialist countries, have begun to search for new ways of attaining their class aims. While not excluding military methods altogether, they are gradually becoming convinced of the futility of making nuclear war their main trump in opposing the socialist countries.

The new attitude to the problem of war and peace is reflected in bourgeois literature in the appearance of numerous monographs and collections of articles presenting the conception of "peace based on mutual fear or deterrence", and various doctrines of arms control.

Among the great flood of publications devoted to the questions of control, the main trend is represented by sociologists who support to a greater or lesser degree the continuation of the arms race. They present in place of the Soviet programme for disarmament various schemes of control that have nothing to do with real disarmament and are intended to justify the

continuation of the arms race, in such a way as would be in the interests of imperialism. While assuming that disarmament is impossible, at the same time they recognise that thermonuclear war would be a disaster for all countries. They thus hold the highly illogical view that war can be prevented not by disarmament but by the continuation of the arms race, maintaining that the further development of military technology is not necessarily such a bad thing since the tremendous destructive capacity of modern weapons should guarantee that neither side will be prepared to risk an all-out military conflict.

The ideas of peace through "the balance of fear" or "mutual deterrence" are expounded by B. Brodie, T. Schelling, H. Kissinger, M. Halperin, J. Strachey, H. Bull, A. Buchan, L. Hallé and R. Osgood.[1]

Some of them hold that the power of nuclear deterrents should be stabilised at the present high level, while others are for the continuation of the nuclear arms race on the grounds that new powerful "balancing" weapons and the improvement of systems of deterrence would serve to improve the international atmosphere.

The various recipes they offer for regulating the arms race by limited arms control do nothing towards removing the threat of nuclear war.

These positions are defended by many of the contributors to the collection, containing articles, speeches and other materials by associates of a number of study centres and research institutes.[2] They differ from the ultra-Right ideologists in that they adopt a more cautious approach to the appraisal of the consequences a nuclear war would entail, and reckon with the risk of it coming to a head. Their recommendations concern mainly the indirect uses of strategic arms. The champions of the so-called controlled arms race show some concern for the danger of a further proliferation of nuclear weapons, and also of an

---

[1] See: B. Brodie, *Strategy in the Missile Age* (Princeton, 1959); T. Schelling, *Strategy of Conflict* (Cambridge, 1960); T. Schelling and M. Halperin, *Strategy and Arms Control* (New York, 1961); H. Kissinger, *The Necessity for Choice. Prospects of American Foreign Policy* (New York, 1961); J. Strachey, *On the Prevention of War* (London, 1962); H. Bull, *The Control of Arms Race* (London, 1960); A. Buchan, *NATO in the 1960s* (New York, 1960), and *The Age of Insecurity*, an article in *Encounter*, 1963, Nos. 6, 7; L. Hallé, *Peace in Nuclear World, Survival*, 1964, Vol. VI, No. 2; R. Osgood, *Limited War*, Moscow, 1960, Russ. ed.

[2] *Safeguard: Why ABM Makes Sense*, Edited by W. R. Kintner, New York, 1969.

accidental outbreak of a big war. "Throughout the next decade of strategic arms," writes Richard B. Foster, Director, Strategic Studies Center of the Stanford Research Institute, "both we and the Soviets will have as a single overriding objective the minimisation of the risk of nuclear war from any cause."[1]

Even though they do not deny the usefulness of Soviet-American talks in that field in principle, the advocates of controlled armament seek to reduce the types of arms embraced by the possible agreement to a minimum. "Strategic superiority" is their prime worry. Some of them agree to the establishment of restraints and the introduction of limitations, but only for some strategic arms and on the condition that extensive possibilities will be afforded for the development of others (anti-missile weapons, for example). They also seek to ensure the unhindered military research and development, and the testing of new kinds of military equipment.

They have much in common with the champions of the "super-armament" schemes we have discussed above. This includes anti-communism, the view that nuclear arms fulfil the function of a political instrument, the willingness under definite conditions to risk unleashing a nuclear war, emphasis on the creation of a varied and extensive arsenal of means for waging an offensive war. In fact, they want the United States to adopt a policy aimed at achieving strategic superiority by controlling the arms race. "The best assurance for peace," William R. Kintner believes, "may lie in the possession of superior power."[2]

The great importance attached by the champions of the controlled arms race conception to strategic superiority, to nuclear force used for the solution of foreign policy aims, conditions their approach to the Soviet-American talks. In R. B. Foster's view, the main purpose of these talks is not to achieve an agreement on the reduction of nuclear stockpiles, but to utilise "the presence of nuclear weapons as an active component of deterrence to influence the behaviour of "antagonistic states".[3] He believes that it is possible, in principle, to establish a definite limitation on the means of delivery of such arms, but at the same time proposes to set up an extensive BMD (Ballistic Missile Defense) system in order to "restabilise the deterrent". He admits that such restabilisation and negotia-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 245.
[2] Ibid., p. 67.
[3] Ibid., p. 256.

tions to establish control over armaments are "two apparently contradictory objectives".[1]

This conception has been worked out in greater detail by D. G. Brennan, former President of the Hudson Institute. He proposes to fix a ceiling for the strategic offensive forces of the USA and the USSR. This ceiling should be set not only for the means they already possess, but also for the systems yet to be installed. As regards missile defence, he insists that full freedom of action should be preserved. Even though Brennan believes that certain limitations might be set on the rate of growth of such military equipment in the yet uncertain future, he considers their development "on a considerable scale" desirable in every way.

The "arms limitations" champions believe that attention should be shifted from the quantitative growth of arms to their qualitative improvement, and that the building of some kinds of missiles should be frozen. They do not want the agreement to restrict extensive military research and development, the building of BMD systems, and work to improve targeting and other parameters of offensive strategic arms. Such an interpretation of the concept "arms limitations" contradicts US commitments under the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

To make their interpretation of the concept "arms limitations" sound convincing, some "experts" on the USSR allege that the Soviet viewpoint is an equivalent of US "hawkish" conceptions. This can be seen from the latest variant of the theory that claims there is a "growing similarity between the two systems", which is supposed to express itself in the development of common negative socio-political processes. Essentially, Kahn's model of the interaction of the opposing systems in conditions of a "substitute war" also presupposes a course under which total militarisation, the curtailing of democratic freedoms, the psychology of a garrison state, etc., would develop in both opposing camps.

The "Sovietologist" R. Kolkowicz deduces his conception of "progressive symmetry" between Soviet and US strategic doctrines and policies from the trends of scientific and technological progress, which, he says, is "an autonomous, transnational, trans-ideological phenomenon that creates and imposes

---

[1] *Safeguard...*, p. 27.

its own imperatives on the fabric of politics".[1] In this way he seeks to camouflage the fundamental differences that exist between Soviet and US foreign policies.

As distinct from the postulates of deterrence, forming the theoretical basis of US foreign policy, the Soviet conception of international relations proceeds from the need for a renunciation of the use or threat of force for the solution of controversial issues between states. This policy has been supplemented by all the measures proposed by the Soviet Union to halt the arms race and to bring about disarmament, to resolve international conflicts by political methods, to develop peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous co-operation between states in all fields. This has been stressed with special force at the 24th Congress of the CPSU.

As far as the Soviet conception of the arms limitation is concerned, it holds that the agreement should be based on the principle of equal security for the parties to the agreement, that it should not provide unilateral advantages, that it should consider in full measure the aim of reducing war danger in general and that it should fall in with the vital interests of all the peoples of the world.

The principle of identical or mutual security opposes the idea of continuing the arms race which, as historical experience has shown, ultimately has a malignant effect on universal security. The Soviet conception proceeds from the belief that the end of the arms race, primarily of nuclear missiles, the most dangerous arms of all, promotes universal security to the highest degree. This basic idea in the Soviet conception has been endorsed by the 24th Congress of the CPSU, which pointed out that the fight for a halt to the arms race, both of nuclear and conventional arms, for disarmament, including general and complete disarmament, will continue to be one of the main trends in the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

Thus, the idea is to halt the arms race in all its forms, which does not mean that the manufacture of some arms should be stopped and that of others stepped up. This applies with special force to strategic arms. It is important to note in that connection that the Soviet delegation voted at the 25th Session of the United Nations General Assembly for the adoption of a resolution calling on all nuclear powers to put an immediate

[1] *World Politics*, Vol. XXIII, No. 3, April 1971, pp. 450-51.

stop to nuclear armament, to all tests, and the development of offensive and defensive nuclear arms systems. The USA abstained when the proposal was voted. This is important to an understanding of the different approaches of the two powers to the strategic arms problem.

The emphasis laid by the Soviet Union on comprehensive arms limitation does not mean that it adheres to the "all or nothing" principle. The American press reported that the USA had resorted to manoeuvres to prevent the inclusion into the list of strategic arms to be limited those stationed near the USSR and other socialist countries (aircraft on carriers, medium-range aircraft on the territory of some West European countries, etc.). This prevented an agreement covering offensive as well as defensive nuclear arms systems, since it would have provided a military advantage to one of the parties.

In trying to achieve real progress at the talks, the USSR proposed that an initial limited agreement should be drawn up, one ensuring the mutual security of the parties. This proposal provides a way out of the impasse.

In May 1971 it was reported that the governments of the USSR and the USA had agreed to concentrate efforts on the preparation of an agreement on limitations in the development of BMD systems. It was also agreed that some measures to limit strategic offensive weapons would be co-ordinated when the agreement was signed.

An agreement on BMD would affect one of the aspects of the rivalry between strategic offensive and defensive weapons. It would cut the ground from under the feet of those who regard the setting up of an extensive BMD system as a component part of the offensive forces and hope that BMD will provide them with a reliable defence against a counterblow, should they decide to unleash a preventive war. Making it perfectly clear that nuclear aggression will not go unpunished, and thus checking nuclear adventurism, such an agreement will promote the security of both parties.

The USSR raises not only the question of limiting strategic arms, but also that of their subsequent reduction, giving preference to a plan that would provide for the reduction of all strategic stockpiles to an absolute minimum, leaving, and only for the time being, a strictly limited number of them.

Hence, in the Soviet view, the principle of equal security should presuppose not a stabilisation of the status quo, but implies the attainment of a higher degree of mutual security

as a result of arms reduction. In other words, the Soviet Union proceeds from the assumption that the maintenance, let alone perpetuation of vast strategic forces, or of the "assured destruction" level, is not a suitable basis for securing reliable mutual security but, on the contrary, is a factor threatening the security of all states. Decisively rejecting the postulates of the nuclear deterrence theory as a basis of international peace, the Soviet conception shows the way to the achievement of a genuinely higher level of security for the participants in the talks and for all other countries. That the Soviet position is a principled one and not just a concession to the present situation can be seen from the Soviet Union's increasing efforts, ever since the war, to ban all means of mass annihilation—nuclear, chemical and bacteriological—and the fact that it does not make this dependent on the solution of other questions. Until the great powers take up nuclear disarmament, the Soviet Union considers it essential to make steps in order consecutively to decrease the role of nuclear arms in international relations.

The USSR believes that the ban on nuclear aggression, on the use and the threat of force, must become universal. That is why the Soviet Union offers to sign corresponding bilateral and regional agreements with countries sharing its views. The signing of such agreements would weaken the positions of the political forces still hoping that they will be able to intimidate other countries.

The development of more and more dangerous kinds of weapon can only be stopped by disarmament, the destruction of the military machine of states and the cessation of military-technological research. This is the course proposed in the Soviet disarmament programme.

Bourgeois ideologists propagating the idea of peace based on "mutual deterrence" try to weaken the great appeal of the Soviet proposals and cast doubt on the possibility of stopping the arms race. They criticise the Soviet programme on several counts.

Ultra-reactionary bourgeois sociologists claim that the Soviet programme contradicts communist ideology to which they attribute the totally alien features of justification of the use of force in international relations, of the arms race and wars between states.

It is on this wholly false interpretation of Marxism-Leninism that the myth about the aggressive nature of the Soviet Union is based, a myth exploited by imperialist politicians to justify

militarisation, the creation of military blocs and their own refusal to conclude disarmament agreements.

The champions of militarism insist that the Soviet disarmament programme is merely a propaganda move, a shrewd diplomatic manoeuvre. They even go as far as to claim that the arms race is beneficial to the Soviet Union.

In point of fact, the idea of general and complete disarmament derives from the principles of scientific socialism, the confidence of the USSR and the world communist movement in the ultimate triumph of their ideals. Disarmament would create the most favourable conditions for practical demonstration of the advantages of the new social system over the old; would speed up the socio-economic progress of mankind as a whole, and create favourable opportunities for carrying out fundamental social transformations by peaceful means.

As for the Soviet Union's willingness to accept disarmament, it is determined by the absence in the country of social classes and groups with a vested interest in war and military programmes, and the conviction that disarmament would enable the country to complete the building of communism far more rapidly.

Accusations of Soviet "insincerity" and "unwillingness" to disarm are smokescreens to hide the fear and doubts of the ideologists of capitalism of the ability of the capitalist system to compete with socialism on a peaceful basis in a disarmed world.

In advancing reactionary views bourgeois sociologists are, often unwittingly, revealing the militarist essence of imperialism. These statements all add up to the fact that imperialism needs a vast military machine, the arms race, and international military conflicts to ensure its very existence, to boost its economy, suppress revolutionary struggles of the masses and the national liberation movement, and impose its will on other peoples.

In the last few years there have been signs of a marked tendency among Western scholars to seek a way out of the danger in the direction of limiting the arms race and steps towards disarmament. Certain constructive measures towards progress and disarmament have been proposed by L. Pauling, K. C. Wright, D. Fleming, A. Etzioni, S. Melman, M. I. Horowitz, F. Baad and many other scholars in the capitalist world.

Various proposals on ways to curb the growth of armaments have been advanced by other known experts, reflecting the

interests of moderate circles. In their view, a continuation of the rivalry in strategic arms will greatly aggravate the risk of nuclear war, intensify the tendency towards nuclear adventurism, escalate military expenditure and make it more difficult to resolve internal socio-economic problems.

Sober-minded people in the USA, including such who held key positions in the Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson administrations, have become aware of that. Thus, Herbert York, former Director Defense Research and Engineering, Office of the Secretary of Defense, says that in the past twenty years "ever-increasing military power has been accompanied by an ever-decreasing national security". He maintains that "the dilemma cannot be resolved by the development and deployment of ever more complex and more costly machines".[1]

Bourgeois social thought is dominated, however, by conceptions justifying and extolling the arms race, considering it an essential and "normal" component of international relations, and wars, the use and threat of force a necessary and permissible instrument for the attainment of political objectives.

It would seem that the baselessness of conceptions justifying the arms race is self-evident. Yet, there are people who advance such conceptions in all seriousness. They are particularly dangerous because they are backed by the most militant political and military circles in the imperialist countries, who are willing to implement their adventurist policies in international affairs.

The champions of militarism want the peoples to get used to the arms race, to the prospect of unending war preparations and ultimately to the idea that the wars planned by the military-industrial complex are unavoidable.

The exposure of the "theorists" advocating war, nuclear blackmail and the arms race is an important task in the fight against the danger of war.

---

[1] Herbert York, *Race to Oblivion: A Participant's View of the Arms Race*, New York, 1970, p. 23.

## Chapter XX

# THE PEACE MOVEMENT AND SOCIALIST HUMANISM

Attitude to the problem of war and peace has today become a touchstone of humanism. This is understandable in an age when tremendous technological progress and the creation of weapons of ever greater destructive capacity have produced a situation where a world war would involve unprecedented suffering and devastation. Even those bourgeois sociologists who in the past were wont to insist that war is inevitable and even beneficial are beginning to recognise this in more and more cases.

Although the peoples of the world are eager to prevent the occurrence of a disastrous war, the problems of preserving peace are far from solved. The danger of war remains because the imperialists, and especially the US imperialists, continue to undertake acts of aggression in various parts of the world, and are gradually widening the theatre of their military operations. While committing countless crimes and outrages in the territories they have seized, the aggressors loudly declare that the main aim of their policy is peace. Many bourgeois ideologists, of the most various views, claim that they are defending the ideas of peace and humanism and the rights of the individual.

It is thus of vital importance to mankind that a clear dividing line should be drawn between humanists in word and humanists in deed. This is essential in order to ensure the unity and solidarity of the great army of peace supporters of which the

peoples of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are in the van, and isolate those militant imperialist ideologists and public figures who are exploiting the undeveloped political awareness of certain layers of bourgeois society.

The attitude of real humanists to the problems of war and peace is formed on the basis of study of social processes as they really exist, on the basis of the actually existing relationship of forces. Good intentions are not enough. What are the real tendencies of present-day social development? Do existing conditions make a nuclear conflict between the two social systems inevitable? That is the question no sociologist studying the problems of war and peace can evade, and the answer to which is bound up with the ways and means of putting humanitarian ideals into practice.

No one who keeps a close watch on international events can fail to observe that it is not merely two diametrically opposed foreign policies that are in conflict but two ideologies—the socialist and the bourgeois. Whatever the issue, whether it be that of removing the threat of world war, strengthening international security, step-by-step disarmament or the development of international trade, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are unvariably the initiators of genuinely peaceful policies, policies that testify to the humanitarian essence of socialism.

Indeed, humanism means making people, their welfare and dignity one's first concern. The humanist's aim is to free man from hostile forces and defend his right to happiness. Humanism appears in many forms—there is genuine humanism and there is false humanism, there is active humanism and there is passive humanism. The majority of bourgeois philosophers are abstract humanists, paying lip service to the rights of the individual. They propose not the real emancipation of the masses, but merely intellectual freedom, that illusory freedom that, as Marx put it, considers itself free even though it is in chains. It was no accident that the founders of Marxism devoted one of their earliest works to exposing the abstract, impotent humanism of the young Hegelians, who "criticised everything" but did not actually do anything to oppose existing evils, and thus were really conservatives for all their "world-shaking" phrases.

Marx and Engels called communism genuine humanism. They not only proclaimed humanitarian principles but linked their practical realisation with struggle against the inhuman policies

of the exploiter classes, and with the revolutionary transformation of society. They saw in society itself, in the proletariat, a force that history had entrusted with a great humanitarian mission.

As Marx and Engels showed, the proletariat has no need of petty-bourgeois philanthropy, hypocritical "sympathy" and gratuitous pity. Socialist humanism, embodied in Marxism—the ideology of the proletariat—demands not the illusion of happiness but genuine happiness, not happiness received as a gift "from above" but happiness won through the efforts of the most progressive class in history, and the rest of the working masses. This active revolutionary element of socialist humanism is more than one of its features; it is an expression of its very essence, what makes it a more advanced one than any previous progressive concept of man.

Marxism takes a new approach to the eternal problems of man and the human personality. It views it as inseparable from social problems, including problems of an international character.

Marxism embodies mankind's longing for a world without war. In indicating the paths along which the struggle for true international brotherhood should be waged, Marx and Engels showed that the ideal of peace could not possibly be realised under the reign of capitalism, but that it would definitely triumph in the communist society of the future. The First Address on the Franco-Prussian War of the General Council of the First International, which bore Marx's signature, said that "in contrast to the old society, with its economic miseries and its political delirium, a new society is springing up, whose International rule will be *Peace*, because its national ruler will be everywhere the same—*Labour*!"[1]

The October Revolution opened a new chapter in the history of mankind and brought nearer the day when mankind's age-old dream of eternal peace would come true. It introduced socialism, to which the urge for expansion and enslavement of peoples is totally alien and which, on the contrary, unites all peoples in one great family.

Lenin struggled ardently against the wars unleashed by imperialism. He stressed that the Communists consider just only those wars waged by the oppressed classes against the oppres-

[1] The General Council of the First International. 1870-71. Minutes. Moscow, 1967, p. 328.

sors, wars waged by peoples in order to win their freedom and independence, wars waged with the object of defending socialism once revolution has triumphed. "All our politics and propaganda, however, are directed towards putting an end to war and in no way towards driving nations to war."[1]

The Soviet State and other socialist countries defended their revolutionary gains by heroic struggle and selfless labour. Their achievements are gradually forcing certain bourgeois groups to regard the policy of peaceful coexistence as an historical necessity. The experience of over fifty years of the existence of the Soviet State has proved beyond doubt that policy of peace, corresponding to the vital interests of all mankind and entirely deriving from Lenin's analysis of the prospects of world socialist development, is the most sensible and realistic policy.

Lenin was firmly convinced that socialism would triumph over capitalism through peaceful economic competition and not through war, by attaining the highest labour productivity in the world, and influencing the course of world history with its economic achievements. Lenin's faith in the power of socialism imbues the whole activity of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government. The CPSU has expounded convincing arguments on the basis of incontrovertible facts that in the present age, characterised by the growing superiority of the forces of peace and socialism over the forces of imperialism and war there exists a real opportunity to abolish war. This deduction is expressed in the decisions of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow and the CPSU Programme. Conflicts fraught with serious consequences have been quashed by the efforts of the supporters of peace, backed by the might of the world socialist system. The mass movement of protest against American aggression in Indochina and Israeli aggression in the Middle East is snowballing rapidly.

Gradually the masses are becoming aware of the fact that war is not inevitable and that the success of the movement for peace depends on their own efforts, on the unity, solidarity and organisation of the great army of peace. The struggle for the realisation of humanitarian ideals, once thought of as the exclusive task of moralists and thinkers, has acquired a firm foundation: humanism becomes an effective force when it relies on the struggle of the masses for their future.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 470.

Marxism-Leninism requires a realistic, sober awareness of things as they really are, a correct appraisal of the relationship of forces in the international arena. The Communist parties cannot exclude the possibility of a world war, should the masses fail to curb the imperialists, who have a vested interest in it. That is why Marxists-Leninists regard the matter of strengthening the might of the world socialist system, including its military might, as the best way of ensuring international security. Thus, the daily creative labour of the peoples of the socialist countries and the development of fruitful co-operation between them is also an effective contribution to the cause of international peace. Socialist humanism is thus inseparably linked with proletarian internationalism and patriotism.

Bourgeois ideologists in an attempt to discredit the aims and methods of struggle of the Communist parties, accuse the Communists of aspiring to universal destruction.

In fact, socialist humanism rejects the idea that man should undergo unwarranted suffering in order to achieve communism. The Marxists-Leninists have always made it their aim to spare the people unnecessary hardships. The Communists have always been openly opposed to Macchiavellianism in politics and reject the Jesuit formula that "the end justifies the means". The Communists have always rejected wanton cruelty and inhuman actions. They do not contrast end and means but regard them as inseparable. As Marx wrote, "an end that involves unjust means is not a just end".[1]

Peaceful coexistence is a form of the class struggle that enables the peoples of the socialist countries to transfer the contest with capitalism to spheres in which it can be beneficial to mankind. The standpoint of the socialist countries is by no means "peace at any price": it is the confidence of the new society in its strength and viability, and ceaseless struggle against reaction and aggression.

It is the humane nature of communism that makes it the great ideal it is. "Communist ideology... is the most humane ideology. Its ideals are to establish truly human relations between individuals and peoples, to deliver mankind from the threat of wars of extermination, and bring about universal peace and a free, happy life for all men on earth."[2]

Socialism, as a more progressive system, negates capitalism.

---

[1] K. Marx, F. Engels, *Werke*, Vol. I.

[2] *Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, pp. 102-03.

But it represents not a direct but a dialectic negation of capitalism, retaining the positive features of the latter. Capitalism is not only an outmoded ugly social order that has outlived its usefulness: it is a level of development of the productive forces, and in many cases a very high one, it is material and spiritual values created by many generations of working people. Socialism inculcates profound respect for the material values created by the working people. The idea that the fruits of his labour should be destroyed in the holocaust of nuclear war is hateful to the working man.

The dichotomy between the two systems of capitalism and socialism engenders certain forms of struggle between them, which may be peaceful or non-peaceful. The history of the world's first socialist state shows that the imperialist states incline to war as a means of resolving the fundamental dichotomy between the two systems, while the socialist state has remained unerringly faithful to Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems.

Bourgeois scholars try very hard to hide or gloss over this side of the matter, often by referring to Lenin's thesis of the inevitability of class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie on a world scale, ending in the complete triumph of the working class. However, the content of the class struggle of the proletariat after it has triumphed over the bourgeoisie in its own country differs greatly from that of the proletariat in countries where the bourgeoisie are still in power. The question of abolishing capitalism in a particular country is essentially the question of overcoming the inherent contradictions between the opposed social forces. The task of overthrowing the social order that is unjust from the point of view of the proletariat in a given country rests squarely on the shoulders of the proletariat of that country. The socialist countries have no intention of exporting revolution, since revolutions have to come about as a result of the exacerbation of class contradictions within a given country. Lenin declared himself categorically opposed to "pushing" revolutions as being "completely at variance with Marxism".[1]

This, of course, does not mean that the peoples of the socialist countries remain indifferent to revolutionary struggles abroad. Faithful to the cause of proletarian internationalism

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 71.

they support the labour movement and national liberation movement throughout the world, and resolutely oppose the efforts of the imperialist powers to export counter-revolution. The growing economic power of the socialist system, the creation of more favourable conditions in the world for the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, and the power of the example of the revolutionary transformation of society—such factors are of tremendous value in promoting the struggle against imperialism. Thus, by supporting peace and peaceful coexistence the Communists are by no means evading their class duty.

Some claim that humanism is a bourgeois, not a socialist slogan, and that in adopting it the Communists are making a concession to bourgeois ideology. Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact that the bourgeoisie at one time proclaimed humanism, freedom and fraternity, does not mean that these slogans correspond to the interests of the modern imperialist bourgeoisie. The latter have long since betrayed the ideals once proclaimed by their class and the standard of struggle for freedom and progress has been taken over and raised high by the Communists and the working masses.

Socialist humanism derives from the class interests of the proletariat. Yet, at the same time, it defends the interests of mankind. There is no contradiction involved here. Today, the universal ideals of mankind are embodied in communist ideals.

The proletariat is the only class in history whose interests in their objective essence correspond with the interests of all progressive mankind. The removal of all the social and national causes of wars between peoples and of imperialist oppression and violence is linked above all with the activity of the proletariat. This is why the founders of Marxism regarded the development of the labour movement and its successes as the condition for social progress. Thus, Engels addressed the English workers as follows: "I found you to be more than mere *Englishmen*, members of a single, isolated nation, I found you to be *Men*, members of the great and universal family of Mankind, who know their interest and that of all the human race to be the same. And as such, as members of this Family of 'One and Indivisible' Mankind, as Human Beings in the most emphatical meaning of the word, as such I, and many others on the Continent, hail your progress in every direction and wish you speedy success... your success is certain, and no step you

will have to take in your onward march, will be lost to our common cause, the cause of Humanity."[1]

Today, when the strength of the international proletariat has increased beyond measure, and with the emergence of its offspring, the world socialist system, we can say without hesitation that the future of mankind depends above all on the activity, enterprise and solidarity of the working masses. It is the historical mission of the proletariat to eliminate the exploiting classes, at the same time itself ceasing to exist as a class and merging with all working people to form a classless society in which the interests of the proletariat and the interests of the other layers coincide and become the general interests. In the struggle for peace against thermonuclear war, the Communists are the bearers of progressive civilisation. This must be stressed in view of the primary importance the Communists attach to preserving the main productive forces—the people who create material and cultural values.

Socialist humanism is essentially militant, since it will not be reconciled to any form of exploitation or violence, since it combats the forces that aspire to war, colonial expansion and the enslavement of peoples. The CPSU attacks complacency and carefree happy-go-lucky attitudes and constantly trains the Soviet people to be ready to take up arms where necessary to defend the gains of socialism. Moreover, it should be noted that if a world war were launched by imperialism, the international proletariat, and the world socialist camp would do their utmost to ensure that the whole system of imperialism were overthrown.

Yet the militant nature of socialist humanism does not mean that the peoples of the socialist countries are encouraged to threaten anybody. On the contrary, Communists act in the interests of universal peace and social progress.

The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties (Moscow, 1969), advanced a broad programme for ensuring peace and international security, which, if carried out, would be in the interests of all peoples. The main points of this programme are: an end to imperialist aggression in Indochina, the elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression in the Middle East, struggle for the complete abolition of colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism, for the reduction of international tension and the settling of outstanding international

[1] K. Marx, F. Engels, *On Britain*, pp. 337-38.

issues by means of talks, for an end to the arms race and the creation of an effective system of collective security.

Marxist-Leninist humanism involves active affirmation of life and the struggle to transform the world on revolutionary principles. N. K. Krupskaya writes of Lenin, that "he was no ascetic", but "loved life in all its manifold beauty, loved his comrades, loved people. Everyone knows of his simplicity, and his gay, infectious laughter. But everything in him was subordinated to one thing—the struggle for a bright, enlightened, prosperous, full and happy life for all. Successes in this struggle made him happier than anything else."[1]

The life-assertive force of socialist humanism is determined by the fact that it is founded on a clear understanding of future social development and confidence in the triumph of Communist ideals, and by the fact that in its very essence it involves the practical activities of the working masses directed towards elimination of the forces that are hostile to them and promotion of the cause of peace.

As Lenin put it: "...we are ardent optimists in what concerns the working-class movement and its aims. We are already laying the foundation of a new edifice and our children will complete its construction."[2]

Inspiring the supporters of peace with confidence in their own strength, communist ideology gives meaning to the activity of every member of the movement for international peace and friendship. Awareness of the connection between the labour and struggle of today and the bright future of all mankind immeasurably increases the energies of all who struggle for progress and helps them surmount the numerous difficulties they encounter on the way.

The struggle waged by the Marxists-Leninists on the ideological front is the struggle of socialist humanism against obscurantism, the struggle of truth against bourgeois falsehood. This struggle only helps to improve the international situation, though some bourgeois publicists try to prove the contrary. Thus, the French sociologist Raymond Aron maintains that according to the logic of peaceful coexistence to which the Communists adhere, they should recognise the need for ideological peace.[3]

---

[1] *N. K. Krupskaya about Lenin*, Collection of articles, Moscow, 1960, p. 291. Russ. ed.

[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 237.

[3] Raymond Aron, "Les Contradictions de la coexistence pacifique", *Le Figaro*, August 29, 1963, p. 1.

Many bourgeois ideologists distort the essence of the struggle waged by the Marxists on the ideological front, equating ideological struggle with cold war.

In point of fact, however, ideological struggle and cold war are totally different concepts. Cold war in the ideological sphere, supported by aggressive forces of anti-communism throughout the world, is a slanderous campaign intended to subvert the socialist system and disorientate the masses in order to facilitate the adventurist actions of the imperialists. The struggle against bourgeois ideology, on the other hand, involves proving on the basis of facts and strict scientific analysis the advantages of socialism over capitalism, exposing the ideological myths of anti-communism, affirming the truth and uniting the masses for the struggle for the bright ideals of mankind.

Bourgeois champions of "ideological coexistence" are in fact deliberately confusing two issues: the question of normal relations between countries with different social systems and the question of the irreconcilability of the bourgeois and communist outlooks. Soviet co-operation with such countries as Afghanistan, Finland and India has shown that relations between states can be successfully developed despite fundamental ideological differences.

As for demands for an "ideological truce", or as American sociologist A. Mayer puts it, the conclusion of a "modern Peace of Westphalia", they are completely vain. Capitalism and its ideologists are not going to get an "ideological armistice" with the socialist world for the simple reason that communist and capitalist ideology are wholly incompatible and irreconcilable. Marxist ideas are born of the struggle for a better future; they have spread all over the world and have already proved their superiority over bourgeois ideology. This is what worries those who adhere to reactionary ideas most of all. The ideological struggle will naturally continue until the total victory of the communist ideology, the most progressive ideology there is, over the bourgeois ideology.

Some bourgeois ideologists, while pretending to accept a policy of peaceful coexistence, demand that the Communists renounce Marxism and sometimes even try to address the socialist countries in the form of an ultimatum. The Marxist-Leninist concept of peaceful coexistence, however, means the desire to wage the inevitable class struggle between the two systems in such spheres as economics and ideology, in accord-

ance with the principles of humanism. The Marxists hold realistic views, and do not expect the ruling elite in capitalist countries to renounce their bourgeois ideology. Unscientific theories and false views cannot be overcome by mere volition, but only as the objective result of long, persistent class struggle, through which the socialist system and its genuinely scientific and genuinely humane ideology will eventually triumph throughout the world.

One cannot help noticing the element of latent fear and embarrassment at the triumphal march of Marxist ideas throughout the world in the bourgeois demand that Communists should renounce Marxism. The fact that many bourgeois ideologists today reject the idea of nuclear war does not remove the deep ideological crisis that grips modern capitalism. The more farsighted bourgeois ideologists cannot help being more and more worried by the question: if not war, then what other future awaits capitalism? Loath to accept the idea that the capitalist system is doomed (sooner or later) to collapse, they try to propagate the old idea of capitalism lasting forever by all sorts of roundabout means: propounding such concepts as that of a single "industrial society", calling upon the peoples to renounce the struggle for national and social emancipation, and so on. Naturally Marxists expose these concepts for what they are. On the basis of the scientific prognosis and experience of the class struggle, Communists will never cease to recognise the inevitability of their ideas being universally adopted.

However hard bourgeois ideologists may try to hide the source of war, it remains the aspirations of the monopolists for unrestrained expansion in order to rob the peoples, win new positions in the world market, increase their profits and set up their economic and political domination throughout the world. The monopolies subdue to their will the organs of power in a country, are ardent supporters of the arms race, of the creation of aggressive blocs, and the suppression of the revolutionary movements of the masses. Since they regard the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries as the main obstacle in their path, their primary aim is to overthrow world socialism.

Of course, even the most inveterate reactionaries today realise that it is not so easy to draw the masses into a new war. That is why they mobilise their ideologists to justify imperialist aggression with myths of the aggressiveness of the socialist coun-

tries, and above all to convince the masses that war is inevitable so they may as well reconcile themselves to it. In this way too, they seek to show the futility of peace movements which represent such serious obstacle to their plans.

Naturally, Marxists-Leninists are well aware that along with the socialist humanists numerous representatives of various trends and shades of bourgeois humanism are interested in peace. The latter may differ from the Marxists in their understanding of various questions of social development, but often engage in useful activity for the cause of peace, exposing war hysteria in the capitalist countries and mobilising the masses to activity in defence of peace. In this respect the activity of the British philosopher Bertrand Russell was characteristic. Pope John XXIII, too, in his famous Encyclical called for an end to the arms race, the banning of nuclear weapons, disarmament under effective international control, peaceful coexistence, equal rights for all nations and states, and an end to war psychosis. What is the communist attitude to such declarations?

Communists do not accept religious-idealist beliefs and views, but consider that the problem of preserving peace affects all people equally, irrespective of their nationality, politics or faith. The Communists make every effort to ensure that all men of good will join forces.

At the same time, the Communists are well aware that preachers of cosmopolitan plans for world unity, a "world state", and other such reactionary ideas often speak from the pacifist rostrum. Under the cloak of "humanism" these people are often, in point of fact, supporting the hegemony of the US monopolies. Clearly this is not to be countenanced.

There are bourgeois "humanists" who preach the "moral value" of suffering in anticipation of the joys of the "beyond", and demand that mankind follow the path of suffering, since this is "God's will". Some bourgeois philosophers see the choice for mankind to lie in either abandoning all further development or being reconciled to the prospect of self-destruction.

Although such openly anti-humanitarian trends in bourgeois sociology as biologism and social-Darwinism have been very largely discredited with the collapse of racist and geopolitical theories, the view is still widely held in the West that the source of wars is to be sought in man's imperfect nature. Thus, the American sociologist L. Kohr writes that "nothing seems to

be more natural to man than aggressiveness and his delight in it."[1]

Observing what a powerful stimulus in people's lives the aspiration towards some high ideal can be, many bourgeois ideologists do their utmost to destroy belief in the very existence of ideals. The Canadian historian A. Lower,[2] for example, writes that even if man journeys into outer space, he will remain the same wild animal he is today, and, falling back on a worn social-Darwinist argument, declares that if man ceased to be a fighting animal he would cease to exist since war is a basic law of life. On the basis of this "argument" he justifies aggressive wars as revealing man's true essence!

Lower rightly points out the obvious fact that the means of destruction are becoming more and more terrible. But he deliberately refrains from mentioning that it is not man's "aggressive nature" that is to blame for the threat that hangs over mankind, but the moribund imperialist system. Lower entitled his article "Man's Future", but all his efforts are directed towards proving that man has no future. Mankind places its hopes in the collective reason of the peoples, which is capable of finding ways of fulfilling their age-old hopes and longings. Lower declares that human reason is only capable of inventing ever-new means of self-annihilation.

Lastly, there still persist to this day attempts to justify war by religion. Reactionary theologians exhort people not to baulk before the "divine" mission on earth of, say, dropping a few H-bombs on the socialist countries for the triumph of the principles of "Christian humanism". As a rule, they preach fiercely aggressive anti-communism, holding that the ideological differences between the socialist and capitalist countries will inevitably lead to armed conflict between them.

Equally fashionable in the West at present are the theories of the bourgeois social-psychologists, who attribute the causes of war to psychological factors, such as the existence of what they call "authoritarian personalities". These theories are expounded by people with various political views, some of them anti-militarist. However, such theories by their very existence serve to mask or distort the social essence of such phenomena as war, fascism and aggression, and are thus not infrequently

---

[1] L. Kohr, *The Breakdown of Nations*, London, 1957, p. 18.
[2] *Queen's Quarterly*, 1962, Winter, p. 542.

employed in practice to "disarm" progressive movements and justify the policies of imperialist reaction.

Appeals for peace are often combined with appeals for passiveness and submission. Bourgeois humanists often preach universal love as the basis for human relations without considering the question of how this should be achieved in practice. For socialist humanism practicability is the main criterion.

The actual stand taken by a bourgeois scholar or public figure on the questions of war and peace is to some extent connected with his views. A person may or may not accept the materialist view of things, yet sooner or later the very logic of the struggle for peace gradually forces him to abandon many idealist illusions. Evolution in the views of many active supporters of peace and progress is the result of their participation in the practical struggle of the masses, in the process of which a person can take cognizance of the real mainsprings of the contemporary world.

Action for peace is an expression of genuine humanism. The political inactivity and ideological apathy of the masses is a condition for the implementation of the imperialists' aggressive plans. Conversely, the realisation in practice of the ideals of peace and socialism requires that every individual be fully aware of his role in the common struggle and act with confidence in victory over the forces of evil. This involves overcoming and throwing off bourgeois ideas of the helplessness of the individual to resist the blows of fortune, understanding the role of the masses as the true maker of history, and active struggle for the triumph of the just cause.

In *The Life of Galileo*, Bertolt Brecht puts into the mouth of Galileo's pupil the following question: "Don't you think that the truth, if it is the truth, will make headway even without us?" To which Galileo replies: "No, no, no! The truth will make headway only in as far as we assist it. The triumph of reason can only be the triumph of people endowed with reason."

Today there exists a powerful bulwark of peace and humanism—the world socialist system. Everything honest and progressive in the world unites around it. And every sincere humanist must promote the strengthening of this foundation, and make his contribution to the cause of preventing war. "We Communists, through all our trials have preserved our devotion heart and soul to the Leninist ideas of peace and friendship between nations. Today, as before, we shall continue to struggle for

these noble, universal aims together with all who oppose the policy of militarism, aggression and war."[1]

Socialist humanism, which is practical humanism, is an invaluable weapon in the struggle for the affirmation of the principles of peace, freedom, and international brotherhood.

[1] *Appeal of the Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties.*